GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY
MARCH 9, 2010

+ + + + +

The Regular Public Hearing convened in Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, pursuant to notice at 10:45 a.m., Marc D. Loud, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

MARC D. LOUD, Chairman MERIDITH MOLDENHAUER, Board Member NICOLE SORG, Board Member

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

PETER MAY, Commissioner (NCPC)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY, Secretary
BEVERLEY BAILEY, Sr. Zoning Specialist

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

MARY NAGELHOUT, ESQ.

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

KAREN THOMAS
MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS
MICHAEL GUILIANI
ARTHUR JACKSON
STEPHEN MORDFIN

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on March 9, 2010.

AGENDA ITEM		PA	AGE
Application No. 18039 of Jason Lefebure	•		. 9
Presentation of Applicant's Case.			. 12
Office of Planning			
Letter in Support			
Vote to Approve			
Application No. 18043 of Mark Ewert and	St	.e	<i>j</i> en
Stichter			
Presentation of Applicant's Case.			
Office of Planning			
Closing Remarks			
Vote to Approve			
Application No. 18036 of Newcomb Child			
Development Center			15
Presentation of Applicant's Case.			
Office of Planning			
ANC Report			
Closing Remarks			
Rescheduled	•	•	.106
Afternoon Session			110
Preliminary Matter	•	•	.110
Application No. 17987 of El Jardin'			
Infantil			
Rescheduled	•	•	.117
Application No. 18044 of Rock Creek Mark	cet	-,	
LLC		•	.121
Preliminary Matter			.122
Office of Planning			
Vote to Dismiss	•	•	.135
Application No. 17975 of Cleotilde E. Ga	alī	<i>J</i> e2	Z
Kimmell			
Presentation of Applicant's Case.			
Office of Planning			
ANC Report			
Closing Remarks			
Vote to Approve			
	-	•	

ADJOURN, Chairman Loud

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2.1

2 | 10:46 a.m.

will please come to order. Good morning,
ladies and gentlemen. This is the March 9,
public hearing of the Board of Zoning
Adjustment of the District of Columbia.

My name is Marc Loud, Chairperson.

Joining me today are Mr. Peter May from the

Zoning Commission to my right. Good morning.

He has joined us and was not part of our

decision meeting earlier. Of course, Mrs.

Moldenhauer and Ms. Sorg, Mayoral Appointees.

To my left Mr. Clifford Moy, Secretary of the

BZA. On my far left Ms. Beverley Bailey,

Zoning Specialist in the Office of Zoning.

Copies of today's hearing agenda are available to you and are located to my left in the wall bin near the door. Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live.

Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from

any disruptive noises or actions in the hearing room.

2.1

When presenting information to the Board please turn on and speak into the microphone first stating your name and home address. When you are finished speaking, please turn your microphone off so that your microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.

All persons planning to testify
either in favor or opposition are to fill out
two witness cards. These cards are located to
my left on the table near the door and on the
witness tables. Upon coming forward to speak
to the Board, please give both cards to the
reporter sitting to my right.

The order of procedure for special exceptions and variances is as follows.

Statement and witnesses of the applicant;

government reports including the Office of Planning, the Department of Public Works, etc.; the report of the Advisory Neighborhood

Commission; parties or persons in support; parties or persons in opposition; and, finally, closing remarks by the applicant only.

Pursuant to Sections 3117.4 and
3117.5 the following time constraints will be
maintained. The applicant, the appellant,
persons and parties except an ANC in support,
including witnesses, are allotted 60 minutes
collectively. Appellees, persons, and parties
except an ANC in opposition including
witnesses are allowed 60 minutes collectively.
Individuals wishing to testify three minutes.
Individuals representing organizations, five
minutes.

These time restraints do not include cross examination and/or questions from the Board. Cross examination of witnesses is also permitted by the applicant or parties only and, of course, the Board. The ANC within which the property is located is automatically a party in a special

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

exception or a variance case.

2.1

Nothing prohibits the Board from placing reasonable restrictions on cross examination. The record will be closed at the conclusion of each case except for any material specifically requested by the Board.

The Board and the staff will specify at the end of the hearing exactly what is expected and the date when the parties must submit the evidence to the Office of Zoning.

After the record is closed no other information will be accepted by the Board.

Again, after the record is closed no additional information will be accepted by the Board.

The decision of the Board in these contested cases must be based exclusively on the public record. To avoid any appearance to the contrary the Board request that persons present not engage the members of the Board in conversation. Please turn off all beepers and cell phones at this time so as not to disrupt

this proceedings.

2.1

The Board will consider any preliminary matters. Preliminary matters are those which relate to whether a case will or should be heard today such as requests for postponement, continuance, or withdrawal, or whether proper and adequate notice of the hearing has been given.

If you are not prepared to go forward with a case today, or if you believe that the Board should not proceed, now is the time to raise such a matter. Does the staff have any preliminary matters?

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board and to everyone, good morning.

Staff does not, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Bailey. Then when you are ready, we should swear the witnesses in. If all persons planning to testify this morning would stand and Ms. Bailey will administer the oath to you.

1	MS. BAILEY: Do you solemnly swear
2	or affirm that the testimony that you will be
3	giving today will be the truth, the whole
4	truth, and nothing but the truth?
5	WITNESSES: I do.
6	MS. BAILEY: Thank you.
7	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Ms.
8	Bailey. When you are ready you can call our
9	first case.
10	MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, the
11	first case is Application 18039. It's the
12	application of Jason Lefebure and it's
13	pursuant to 11 DCMR Section 3104.1, for a
14	special exception for a rear addition to an
15	existing one-family detached dwelling under
16	Section 223, not meeting the side yard
17	requirements of Section 405. The property os
18	zoned R-1-B. It's located at 1510 Kearney
19	Street, N.E., Square 4010, Lot 44.
20	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Ms.
21	Bailey. If the parties are here for the first
22	case, if you could please come forward to the

1	table. Good morning. If you could come
2	forward to the table. Once seated cut the
3	microphone on. A green light will come on at
4	the base of the microphone if you cut it on
5	correctly. Introduce yourselves for our
6	record.
7	MR. LEFEBURE: Jason Lefebure.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Good morning.
9	MR. BURKE: My name is John Burke.
10	I'm Jason's architect. I've been admitted to
11	speak before the Board previously.
12	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Good morning,
13	Mr. Lefebure and Mr. Burke. Let me just jump
14	out and say this at the outset and let my
15	colleagues weigh in. I think that we have a
16	very well put together package supplemented by
17	a well put together report from the Office of
18	Planning.
19	The relief that you're looking for
20	is fairly straightforward relief in terms of
21	the types of cases that we hear weekly. It's

what we call Section 223 relief single-family

addition. In this case it doesn't meet the side yard requirement.

2.1

I would think that it's a case
that we can probably rest on the record on but
I wanted to ask other Board Members instead of
a full-blown presentation perhaps if there are
any specific questions that Board Members have
of the applicant we can get those out
initially so if the applicant can address
those specific questions, then perhaps we an
move through the case fairly expeditiously.

Does that sound like a good approach? All right. Do any Board Members have any specific questions that they would like this applicant to be able to respond to? It doesn't appear such so why don't we turn back to you.

You can give us a very brief opening statement. Just describe the relief that you're looking for. As I said, I don't think this will take very long for us to move into deliberation this morning.

1	MR. BURKE: Mr. Lefebure has a
2	house up in the Brooklyn neighborhood zone R-
3	1-B. The property was built circa 1930.
4	Therefore, before the 1958 zoning regulations
5	went into effect. As a result the width of
6	his property is only 35 rather than the 50
7	that the zoning regulations currently call
8	for.
9	In accordance with that, his side
10	lots do not meet the minimum eight-foot
11	standard. He would like to add on to the rear
12	of the house about 8 feet 11 inches. He would
13	like to not in any way infringe or worsen the
14	side yard condition. He would like to keep
15	the existing house as it presents to the
16	street consistent with character and quality
17	of the neighborhood.
18	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
19	Burke. Is there anything you wanted to add to
20	that, Mr. Lefebure?
21	MR. LEFEBURE: No.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All right.

1	Don't make me say that name one more time,
2	please.
3	In terms of the Office of Planning
4	we do have a copy of your report. It is our
5	Exhibit 26. It's a very well-written report
6	obviously. Is there anything in it that you
7	would like to highlight?
8	MR. GUILIANI: Nothing in
9	particular but I would be happy to answer any
10	questions should the Board Members have any.
11	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Why don't we
12	see if Board Members have any questions for
13	you. It doesn't appear such. Does the
14	applicant have any questions for the Office of
15	Planning? Again, it doesn't appear such
16	either.
17	We would now go to the ANC for a
18	report. I don't believe we received a report
19	from the ANC in this case so we'll bypass that
20	part of the hearing.
21	If there are parties or persons in
22	support of this application that are currently

in the audience, now would be the time to come up.

If there are parties or persons in the audience that are in opposition to this application, now would be the time to come up.

Seeing none come up, I just want to note for the record that there is an Exhibit 23 letter from Gary Gregory who is a neighbor. I believe Mr. Gregory lives directly behind the property. In the letter he mentions the fact that there is a deep rear lot sort of separating the addition and his property. He doesn't anticipate any adverse light or air impacts I think is the gist of it. It's a letter in support of the application.

With that we turn back to you now for any closing remark and I think we'll be ready to deliberate on this in a few moments if you have any closing remarks. Okay. Thank you for your submission, your appearance here this morning.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	As indicated, it's a very well put
2	together application requesting very modest
3	relief. I think we are going to deliberate on
4	this this morning to the extent we need a
5	full-blown deliberation. Is there a Board
6	Member that wants to lead us off in this?
7	MEMBER SORG: I can.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Ms.
9	Sorg.
10	MEMBER SORG: So this is, as you
11	say, Chairman Loud, a rather simple 223
12	application for a special exception to allow
13	a three-story rear addition to an existing
14	one-family dwelling in the R-1-B zone at 1510
15	Kearney Street, N.E.
16	The applicant has provided in
17	their prehearing submissions at Exhibit Nos.
18	7 and 24 very well documented plans showing
19	plans and elevations as well as renderings of
20	the proposed addition.
21	In this case there is no word from
22	the ANC-5A. They didn't submit a report in

this case but, as you mentioned, Chairman Loud, there is support registered by the neighbors at our Exhibit 23.

2.1

Like I said, this seems to be a very straightforward 223 case for relief not meeting the side yard requirements. The applicant is asking for relief on both side yards but our OP report indicates that actually only relief for the west side yard is required. That is under Section -- I'm not sure.

In any case, accordingly, as you mentioned, the OP report is very well put together in this case. Instead of being redundant with its points and analysis I would incorporate that by reference and their recommendation to approval and that's, as you mentioned, also our Exhibit No. 26.

So I think, as you said, we can rest on the record in this case which seems very full. I would voice my support for Mr.

Lefebure's application and with that open the

1	deliberations for discussion.
2	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you,
3	Board Member. Is there further discussion or
4	is there a motion if there is not further
5	discussion?
6	MEMBER SORG: I can make a motion
7	if there isn't.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you.
9	MEMBER SORG: So I would like to
10	submit a motion in Application No. 18039 of
11	Jason Lefebure pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1, for
12	a special exception for a rear addition to an
13	existing one-family detached dwelling under
14	Section 223, not meeting side yard
15	requirements at 1510 Kearney Street, N.E. for
16	approval of the application for relief.
17	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you. Is
18	there a second?
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
20	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Motion has been
21	made and seconded. Any further discussion?
22	Hearing none, all those in favor say aye.

1	ALL: Aye.
2	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Is there any
3	opposition and/or abstentions?
4	Ms. Bailey, can you read back the
5	vote, please.
6	MS. BAILEY: With pleasure, Mr.
7	Chairman. It is recorded as four zero one to
8	grant the application. Ms. Sorg made the
9	motion, Commissioner May seconded it, Board
10	Members Moldenhauer and Loud support the
11	motion. Board Member Dettman is not present
12	today.
13	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Ms.
14	Bailey. I don't believe there is any
15	opposition so this could be a summary
16	decision. Is that correct?
17	MS. BAILEY: Summary decision.
18	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Which
19	means that the applicant would get a written
20	decision in the mail the next couple of days.
21	Thank you for your presentation. Thank you
22	for your patience this morning. If there is

nothing further on this case, I think we can call the next case.

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, the second case of the hearing is the application of Newcomb Child Development Center and the number is 18036 and it's pursuant to 11 DCMR Section 3104.1 for a special exception for a child development center. That's 39 children and 13 staff, under Section 205. The property is located at 541 Newcomb Street, S.E. It is zoned R-5-A. It's located in Square 5985 on Lot 818.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Bailey. I'm going to suggest we go out of order. At least go according to the order I have, perhaps out of order with the version that you might have with the schedule. I actually have the Mark Ewert case as next, 18043. If it's okay with colleagues I would like to call that case first because I don't think that case will take as much time as the Newcomb case may take.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	MS. BAILEY: As you indicated, Mr.
2	Chairman, Application 18043, Mark Ewert and
3	Steven Stichter and it's pursuant to 11 DCMR
4	Section 3103.2 for a variance from the lot
5	occupancy requirements under Section 403, a
6	variance from the rear yard requirements under
7	Section 404, and a variance from the
8	nonconforming structure provisions under
9	Subsection 2001.3, to allow a rear first floor
10	deck addition to an existing row dwelling.
11	The property is located in the R-4
12	District. It's also located at 401 Rock Creek
13	Church Road, N.W. Square 3236, Lot 46.
14	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Ms.
15	Bailey. I see the applicant has come to the
16	table.
17	Good morning. If the applicant
18	and counsel can state your name for the
19	record.
20	MR. SULLIVAN: Good morning. My
21	name is Martin Sullivan here on behalf of the
22	applicant.

MR. STICHTER: My name is Steven
Stichter and I reside at 401 Rock Creek Church
Road, N.W. in Washington, D.C. with my partner
Mark Ewert.

both of you. Let me state at the outside and disclose fully that I know Mr. Steven

Stichter. Mr. Steven Stichter used to work for the D.C. Main Street office and in my other life as Executive Director of Gateway

Georgia Avenue, from which I resigned February 28th, but Mr. Stichter was our program liaison for our Main Street branch, one of several branches we had.

I want to disclose on the record that I do know him and I did work with him for about a year in that capacity. He has not been there, I think, for a couple of years and I don't think there is anything about my prior acquaintance with him that would cause me to be impartial in review of this case, in review of this matter. I did want to disclose it on

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	the record and give my colleagues an
2	opportunity to ask questions or so on and so
3	forth.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I
5	just want to clarify what you said. It
6	sounded like you said that it would not cause
7	you to be impartial. I assume it would cause
8	you to be partial.
9	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: It would not
10	cause me to be partial. Thank you for
11	clarifying that.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: It may have
13	been my hearing. I just want to make sure I
14	heard the right thing.
15	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you.
16	Very important point. Words matter.
17	Are there any other questions?
18	Okay. Then given that there are no objections
19	from my colleagues and that I do not believe
20	that the prior acquaintance would cause me to
21	be partial toward Mr. Stichter, or against
	l i

him, I would like to remain on the case. I

think we can move forward.

2.1

I think as Ms. Bailey had indicated, this is an area variance request. The property is currently nonconforming at 75 percent. It would go up to 97 percent lot occupancy with the proposed addition. The applicant needs to make a case out for the area variance.

Why don't we turn to the applicant and ask counsel and/or the applicant to walk us through how the test was made.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Board. We are requesting three separate area variances as described in our prehearing statement. We do believe that the application safely meets the variance test.

On point 1, the unique condition, there are several unique factors so we believe there is a confluence of factors. Chiefly among them is the size of the lot and the size of the home. Can I add an exhibit? I think

I neglected to put it in the prehearing statement which shows a plat showing the surrounding lots on the block and the size of those lots.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Just so you know, I think we also have a version of that as part of our OP report, page 2.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. Thanks. I wasn't sure if you had that. I think this highlights perfectly the impact of the size and I would site a finding from a previous BZA case that says if the lot were as large as the average lot size in the square, there would be no need for a variance in order to construct the deck.

That's where our practical difficulty comes in strictly complying with the regulations. A small deck such as this would not be a problem on virtually almost any other lot except the neighboring lot in this square. Also, I would like to point out, of course, that the size of the lot and the size

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1 of the home were as is prior to 1958. 2 Regarding the third prong of the 3 test, no detriment to the public good, we 4 think the addition of the deck is an aesthetic 5 improvement to the lot. We are not aware of 6 any opposition. We expected a letter of 7 support from one of the immediate neighbors. 8 The other immediate neighbor. 9 The other immediate neighbor had 10 expressed orally that she had no opposition. I don't believe she was going to submit 11 12 anything. We have ANC support. Although the 13 request is for a variance all the way up to 97 14 percent it's really a small deck. It's less 15 than 200 square feet. It's the size of a lot 16 that makes that percentage so high. With that 17 I would move on to testimony of Mr. Stichter if there are no questions at this point. 18

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: It doesn't appear if there are any questions so feel free to move on.

MR. STICHTER: Just to add a

NEAL R. GROSS

19

20

2.1

couple of -- so I live at 401 Rockcreek Church Road. I've been there for four years and my partner has owned the house for almost seven and is the third owner of the house. The lot is a very small lot particularly in comparison to the neighboring property.

Interestingly it's a triangularshaped lot which also makes a partially
triangular-shaped house. While that is an
interesting aesthetic, which we enjoy and
appreciate, it also constrains the interior
size of the house which is part of our desire
-- adds to our desire to have useable outdoor
space connected to the house.

Due to the topography of the area the front door of the house is about 12 steps up from the sidewalk so that the backyard is a full floor above the level of the alley.

Due to this and the narrow stairway that leads down to the basement, which would be our access to the backyard combined with the triangular-shaped backyard being right up

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

against the alley, really limits the use and enjoyment of that lot.

To give you a sense of the size of the back lot despite heroic efforts on a couple of times when we were trying to see if our car, a Honda Civic, would be able to fit into the backyard we couldn't park the car there without it obstructing the alley. That is due both to the size and the shape of the lot.

We enjoyed entertaining and would like to make use of that space. The deck that is proposed would be right off of the kitchen on the main living space. We have a traditional original layout of the house which we are interested in maintaining but that also leaves us with a small kitchen and space for such uses. It would be a significant addition to us in the kind of living space that we have available and allowing us to use that limited space in the backyard.

One item that I wanted to note,

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	and I'm not sure that it was in the record,
2	there was a deck in existence when Mark Ewert
3	purchased the house. It was a brick and
4	concrete deck that was pulling away from the
5	house and had a crumbling floor. It was a
6	danger and taken down for that reason.
7	We wanted to note on we have
8	gone I believe you have the statement from
9	the ANC. We went before our ANC earlier this
10	month and the ANC voted to support our
11	application. A neighbor indicated that he was
12	submitted a letter of support.
13	I did meet with the Office of
14	Planning last week and that was a productive
15	meeting so given the size of this lot, the
16	shape of the backyard, we believe that we are
17	meeting the test for this variance and ask for
18	your support in our application.
19	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
20	Stichter.
21	Mr. Sullivan, did you have
22	anything further?

1	MR. SULLIVAN: No, Mr. Chairman.
2	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Board
3	Members, are there any questions for counsel
4	or Mr. Stichter?
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Just a couple
6	of quick ones. How large was the previously
7	existing deck? Did it cover the entire
8	backyard or did it come out 10 feet from the
9	house or five feet from the house?
10	MR. STICHTER: I believe it was
11	about six week. It did not cover the entire
12	back yard.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: What is the
14	area that would actually be covered by the
15	roof of the deck? There is a portion of the
16	proposed deck that has a roof on it?
17	MR. STICHTER: Yes, in the
18	drawing. It would be it's proposed to run
19	diagonally perpendicular from the side lot
20	line to the corner of the house. It looks
21	approximately half of the area. That
22	placement was chosen specifically to ensure

that there were no drainage issues on the
neighbor.
COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. That's
it. Thanks.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
May. Just one quick question for Mr.
Stichter. Currently you would access the rear
from the lower level?
MR. STICHTER: That's correct.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: As proposed you
would access the rear from the kitchen?
MR. STICHTER: That's correct.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: What is the
room in the lower level that you exit from to
access the rear now?
MR. STICHTER: It's the basement
of the house.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Is it set up as
a den or living area?
MR. STICHTER: It's a sort of
where our utilities and such are but I would

1 call it more of a project space rather than a 2 -- it's not a space where -- we certainly use 3 the space but it's not an active part of our 4 standard living quarters. 5 CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I'm not saying 6 that this would amount to a practical 7 difficulty in every case because attorneys 8 read the decisions and blow them wide open but 9 it just sounds kind of strange to prepare all 10 of your recreational meals in the kitchen and 11 then have to go downstairs through this 12 storage and utility area to be able to bring 13 the food out to access the rear yard as 14 opposed to just having that availability at 15 the level of the kitchen floor. 16 Why don't we turn to the Office of 17 Planning. Good morning. 18 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Good morning, 19 Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board. I'm 20 Maxine-Brown Roberts from the Office of 2.1 Planning. I want to get right to your comment

about the access issues. I think when we

reviewed the application at first we agreed that there are unique conditions for both the house and the property. We got stuck on the demonstration of the practical difficulty by the applicant. Basically what we took from the submission there is a practical difficulty just because it's a small site. We were looking for a little bit more information.

As the applicant stated, he met with us and we did ask them again for some additional information concerning how the internal workings of the house is and how they would get from the upper floor to the lower floor. We do think that is where the practical difficulty lies in what is the layout of the upper floor and how they would move from the kitchen with stuff to access their rear yard and use the rear yard as they want to.

As you see in our report, that was some of the things that we think we did have enough information to make that determination

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	and that was sort of why our recommendation is
2	that we couldn't support the application.
3	We didn't go into an outright
4	denial but just that it was based on the
5	regulations we couldn't support that because
6	we just didn't have the information. Thank
7	you.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Have you heard
9	anything this morning that would soften the
10	position in the exhibit?
11	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I think,
12	again, it goes back to the question that you
13	just asked because that was the same question
14	that we asked, how can you sort of demonstrate
15	to us because we did ask, say, a layout of
16	what it is inside and what is it downstairs so
17	we could make that determination. Yes, I
18	think that's a valid practical difficulty.
19	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Thank
20	you. Is there anything in addition that you
21	would like to add to your report?
22	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: No.

1	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Let's
2	turn to Board Members and see if there are any
3	questions and then we can turn to counsel for
4	applicant. It doesn't look like Board Members
5	have any questions. Mr. May looks like one
6	may be percolating. All right. Does counsel
7	for applicant have any questions for OP?
8	MR. SULLIVAN: No, Mr. Chairman.
9	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Then at this
10	point we would turn to the ANC for its report.
11	This is ANC-4C. They did submit a report at
12	Exhibit 24. Is anyone here from ANC-4C?
13	There's no one here from the ANC but, as
14	indicated, they did submit a report.
15	It was properly noticed. It had a
16	quorum and it voted in favor of the relief
17	being sought by the applicant so we'll note
18	for our record the great weight for that
19	report. I'm actually looking for a copy. I
20	think once we deliberate I'll mention the
21	specifics of the report but it is, again,

Exhibit 24.

1	Further, if there are persons in
2	support of the application that are in the
3	audience who want to come up and give
4	testimony, you will be given three minutes to
5	do that. If there are persons in the audience
6	who are in opposition, the same three minutes
7	to state your opposition.
8	Seeing none in either regard, I'll
9	just note for the record that we were just
10	handed an exhibit from a neighbor, I believe,
11	in support. Yes, Exhibit 26. It's from
12	Eduardo Suarez and it looks like Neal Pane.
13	In any event, they live south of the property
14	and support the application so we'll note that
15	for our record.
16	Then we turn back to you, Mr.
17	Stichter and/or Mr. Sullivan for any closing
18	remarks.
19	MR. SULLIVAN: Nothing but to
20	respectfully request a bench decision and
21	summary order. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All right.

With that thank you for the presentation.

Thank you, OP, for both the report and the openness to getting to the bottom of all of the issues on the table in the case. I think we are ready to deliberate this morning on the case. I'll lead off the deliberations.

As indicated it's a proposal to construct roughly a 190-foot square foot deck to the rear of a house which sits on a triangular shape and very small lot. This increases the lot occupancy from the existing non-conforming 75 percent to 97 percent in additional to which it creates a rear yard issue of noncompliance because it doesn't set back 20 feet as required under the regulations. The applicant is here for area variance relief.

In terms of making the requirements of the test, the applicant indicates, and I think OP agrees with the applicant on this, that it's a triangular shaped lot. It's at the end of a series of

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

lots and it abuts the alley. Very small lots, about 972 square feet.

The small shape in addition to the triangular sides creates a practical difficulty. We heard a little bit about it this morning. It's also in the pleadings.

Most notably that the creation of a deck would relieve this applicant from the inconvenience of having to carry food stuffs to recreate outside from the kitchen upstairs to down stairs through utilities and throughout what they describe as basement sort of downstairs area on every occasion that they recreate outside.

There are some additional practical difficulties that some of the other Board Members may want to mention but I think that comes to my mind immediately that it just seems like the interior circulation doesn't flow with that configuration.

In terms of meeting the test of whether or not there would be substantial

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	detriments of the public good, I think the
2	evidence is that there would not be. This is
3	zoned residential already and the use
4	obviously just embellishes the residential
5	use. It's such a small place and this gives
6	them an opportunity to recreate outside. It
7	may put some eyes on the alley which would
8	contribute to the public good.
9	I think overall it's a bit of a
10	close call but I think the extremely small
11	size of the lot, the triangular shape of the
12	lot, its placement at the end of the series of
13	lots, are all factors, a confluence of
14	factors, that create this practical difficulty
15	for the applicant.
16	With that I will open it up to
17	other Board Members for any thoughts.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I
19	would just add a couple of things. I would
20	agree certainly that the property is unique.
21	It's triangular. It's small. It's very clear

that it passes that prong of the test.

I think that the Office of

Planning's report suggest that the objective

of being able to make use of the yard can be

met by a landing and a stair. I have to say

frankly I'm not convinced that would work and

provide any substantive useable space. Just

to have a landing that is probably 25 square

feet. You have a stairs and that's another 35

That's 60 square feet of square stuff that would need to be in a triangular lot connected to a door that is very close to the corner of the triangle. That is going to eat a third or more of the backyard and then drop you down to basically what would feel like an alley space unless you put up a big fence in which case it's not a very pleasant space.

I think what is being proposed is very modest. The decking over the entire yard I don't think is of any detriment to the neighbors. I think one might be a little bit

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

square feet.

concerned about the portion of it that would have a roof over it but even so because of the position of the house, the fact that if there is any impact on the sun that reaches the property to the north it would be in the afternoon only because of the position of the building.

Otherwise, the sun is already restricted by the position of this house compared to the neighbor's house. I think that has been very carefully done. We could have been wrestling with a proposal that had a roof over the entire deck which, I think, would have a much more significant impact on the neighbors.

I think given the modesty of it, I think it's an easy call to make. Of course, with due recognition of the Office of Planning's concern about having everything demonstrated effectively to address the regulations. I think it would have been an easier call for them to make if some of these

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	things were shown, if there was a drawing of
2	a stair and landing to prove that it didn't
3	work.
4	If there were a demonstration of
5	what the defense might do to the useability of
6	that little triangular yard, I think you could
7	prove the case that it would not be practical
8	and probably would have met their test as
9	well. I'm very comfortable proceeding in
10	favor of this.
11	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
12	May. Is there further?
13	Okay. If there is no further
14	discussion then I would like to move approval
15	of Application No. 18043, request for variance
16	relief, at 401 Rock Creek Church Road, N.W.
17	for a deck addition that does not meet the
18	requirements of the lot occupancy under 403.2,
19	the rear yard under 404.1, and Section 2001.3
20	regarding additions to nonconforming
21	properties.

Is there a second?

NEAL R. GROSS

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
2	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Motion has been
3	made and seconded. Is there further
4	discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor
5	say aye.
6	ALL: Aye.
7	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I don't believe
8	there is any opposition. Are the any
9	abstentions?
10	Ms. Bailey, if you could read back
11	the full vote.
12	MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, the
13	vote is recorded as four zero one to grant the
14	application. Mr. May made the motion I'm
15	sorry, Mr. Loud made the motion, Commissioner
16	May seconded the motion, Mrs. Moldenhauer and
17	Ms. Sorg support the motion. Board Member
18	Dettman is not present.
19	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Ms.
20	Bailey. Thank you to the applicants. Thank
21	you very much to the Office of Planning as
22	well. I do believe we can do a summary.

1	MS. BAILEY: A summary order it
2	is, Mr. Chairman.
3	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. We'll do
4	a summary order. You'll get the decision in
5	a couple of days. Thank you.
6	I believe we have one final case
7	this morning which is the Newcomb case. I'm
8	going to need to break for just two seconds to
9	get my file. I thought I had gotten it
10	earlier but apparently I did not.
11	In the Newcomb case is there
12	anything to set up in the case? Okay.
13	Nothing to set up. I see Commissioner
14	Cuthbert. Good morning. How are you? Is the
15	ANC going to submit a written report? You did
16	submit a written report?
17	Okay. Before we get started let
18	me double check to make sure that al of us
19	have copies of that. I don't believe I have
20	a copy so do you have a copy? Okay. Mr. May
21	definitely has a copy. Some of us have copies

and some of us don't so we are making sure

1	that everybody has a copy. As we do that
2	we'll take a break for about two minutes. I'm
3	going to go get my file and I'll be right
4	back.
5	(Whereupon, at 11:27 a.m. off the
6	record until 11:31 a.m.)
7	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Please excuse
8	our delay. I think we are ready to move
9	forward. Just, as I said, there were some
10	pleadings that came in yesterday. In fact,
11	some came in around 4:00 p.m. yesterday and we
12	had copies. Some of had copies of some and
13	did not have copies of others but I think we
14	are all in the same position now. We have
15	everything we need.
16	Have we called this case? If not,
17	perhaps until Ms. Bailey comes back you can
18	help us out.
19	MR. MOY: I can do that.
20	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Thank
21	you.
22	He's going to call the case and

1	once he calls the case then you can come
2	forward.
3	MR. MOY: That would be
4	application number 18036 of Newcomb Child
5	Development Center pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1,
6	for a special exception for a child
7	development center. This is for 39 children
8	and 13 staff under Section 205, in the R-5-A
9	District at premises 541 New Comb Street, S.E.
10	The property is in Square 5985, Lot 818.
11	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
12	Moy. If we could have the parties who are at
13	the table this morning introduce yourselves
14	for our record.
15	MR. SPIKES: Harry Spikes,
16	representative of Newcomb Day Care.
17	MS. CANNON: Andrea Jackson
18	Cannon, Executive Director.
19	MS. SPIKES: Patricia Spikes,
20	Director, Newcomb Child Development Center.
21	MS. CUTHBERT: Mary Cuthbert,
22	Chair for Advisory Neighborhood Commission 8C

1	and Single Member District 8C-03.
2	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Good morning to
3	each of you. Thank you for your presence this
4	morning. I believe we are here on the
5	application for now 39 young people and 13
6	staff.
7	MR. SPIKES: Yes, sir.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: It's not
9	necessarily a follow-on to the earlier hearing
10	we had for about 72 or 72, I forget exactly
11	what it is, but, nonetheless, I think that you
12	are prepared to move forward and establish a
13	case under Section 205 if the requirements are
14	met?
15	MR. SPIKES: Yes.
16	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Then why
17	don't we turn it over to you for your
18	presentation and then Board Members I'm
19	certain have some questions that they would
20	like to get into.
21	MR. SPIKES: Thank you.
22	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Could I just

1	ask a preliminary question
2	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Yes.
3	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: that you
4	may be able to address? Chairman Loud and
5	also Mr. Moy mentioned that the notices were
6	for 13 staff but in your recent submission No.
7	30 you referenced 14 staff. If you can just
8	clarify that point when you provide the
9	presentation, that would be great.
10	MR. SPIKES: I will leave that up
11	to the director to make those clarifications.
12	First of all, I would like to say that we have
13	planned to come here with the binders and
14	everything filed prior to the hearing in
15	sufficient time for you to make the review.
16	We was unable to do that so I apologize for
17	not coming here to impress you with that.
18	We did file some material
19	yesterday which was the day before this
20	hearing, of course, and we have received from
21	the District of Columbia Immunization Program
22	100 percent approval of immunization shots and

that was received by us on the 5th of March, which was Friday. The earliest time we could have gotten that to you was yesterday so we got that to you yesterday.

Some of the material that we have given you is material that we have to rely on the District and other sources to provide us in order for us to provide you to show compliance with some of the requirements that may have been part of the consideration of your not approving us the last go ground.

I think I would be better to

answer whatever question the Board may ask

except to the point that based on what we have

filed with you we have met all of the

requirements of the licensing in the District

of Columbia regulation as far as maintaining

and operating Newcomb Day Care on Newcomb

Street.

Those deficiencies that were cited at the last hearing have all been taken care of to the extent that they have been abated.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

We are not here to debate whether some of those things that were cited as deficiencies were, in fact, deficiencies.

For example, with the immunization shots, as we explained in our presentation, the doctors were the individuals who would determine when those immunization shots were proper and when they were to be given. It would be based on the -- the doctor would base it primarily on the health of the child at the time the child is being examined, the previous shot the child had been given, and when would be the appropriate shot at the appropriate time, the next shot.

The reason we fell in a gray area in that particular instance is that when the District prepares a document that give us a deadline and time certain for those shots to be given, that deadline and time certain may defer from that of the doctor so, therefore, if a child goes to the doctor and the doctor say, "Your previous shot was in March," and if

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

the schedule that the District give us say the shot should be given in July, the doctor may determine that the shot may need to be given in August.

So with that being the case that the District come out to examine the records, the District will see that the child has not been given a shot but that would not be because we did not make the child available for the shot and it would not be because the parent didn't know that the child did not or did need the shot. It would be the doctor's determination so that's how we fell into an area gray in that respect.

In another respect we had a situation dealing with the fingerprint for verification of the criminal background search. We fell in a gray area there, too, but that area, as I said, I'm here to debate deficiencies, what we did in effect was to take the original documents for the fingerprints and the verification of the

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

criminal background search and we kept those in a separate folder and we put the copies in the folder for the employee.

when the monitor came out to
examine the file, the monitor came to
understand that we had copies of the results
in the file rather than the originals. The
reason we put copies in the file is that we
didn't want anyone to go into the employee
file and take the police results, the criminal
background search results, and modify them to
fit their specification and, therefore, there
would be an action of falsifying records.

What we did was to keep the originals in a safe place under security. Now we have revamped that practice and we have everything available for the monitors. Should the monitors come out she or he would be able to examine those documents on site without any encumbrances. So we covered the shot records and the immunizations.

We have a situation dealing with

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

staff. We had a problem as far as staff health certificates are concerned. There, again, I will say to you that we may have really fallen short in that respect in the previous process. We fell short in that we will always explain to our staff within sufficient time to get an updated health certificate before the present health certificate expires.

What happened is that when the staff would go to the doctor, the doctor would say, "Well, we can't see you today," or "We have to postpone the examination."

Unfortunately, we would have scheduled the examination so close to the expiration date of the health certificate that the health certificate could very well expire before a new health certificate is issued.

What we are in the process of doing now, and have done this, is made arrangements so that we would have our staff to visit a doctor in a time sufficient

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

irrespective of any postponements of the examination to get an examination that would be the consequence of a health certificate that would be within the framework and within the time period of a non-expired health certificate.

That being the case, we have placed the health certificate in good standing as far as they are not expiring before we get a new health certificate. We have a situation with parking and I think the documentation that you have explains that all of our employees expect to live in the adjacent community, some in walking distance and others who catch the bus, and we have two employees who drive.

There is ample parking provision
on Newcomb Street for those two individuals
who drive. The yard in Newcomb Street is used
for recreation for the kids but the hilly area
and the terrain is such that it would be
practically unfeasible to erect a parking

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1 space there.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

Even if we did it would cause a hazard as far as the alley is concerned because the alley is no narrow and the pathways in which the cars would come in and out would cause a problem because the decline is so steep that on a snowy day the cars may just slide out of the parking area.

Beyond that, Mr. Chairman, I don't know what else to add unless you have questions for me.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Mr. Spikes?

MR. SPIKES: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.

Spikes. I appreciate the transparency and the

16 stepping up to the plate regarding

acknowledging some of the things in the past.

18 | I have a couple of questions just so I can

19 make sure I understand what I'm looking at

20 here and what we've marked Exhibit 30. In

21 | terms of the criminal background checks for

22 all staff and then what's attached later I

1	guess the representation is being made that
2	those are all of the staff for which criminal
3	background checks were at issue in the earlier
4	hearing. I'm looking at Patricia Spikes and
5	there are some other names here. I kind of
6	want to get a sense of what it actually is
7	that I'm looking at.
8	MR. SPIKES: I think Ms. Spikes
9	can explain that.
10	MS. SPIKES: In reference to the
11	criminal background checks previously before
12	we were required to have FBI background checks
13	we got criminal background checks before
14	anyone started working at Newcomb.
15	With the FBI reports, the copy of
16	the fingerprint is what we actually do on the
17	
	card. Then we send it off. The second sheet
18	comes back, it could be months later or weeks
19	later, stating whether, you know, no arrest
20	record was found on this person.
21	Included with the background
22	checks you might see a receipt. What that

1	means is the employee had the FBI check done
2	but the result has not returned. We have no
3	control over how long the FBI will send the
4	results back so that's what these forms mean.
5	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Well, again,
6	just for the record so that when we move to
7	deliberation I'm really clear on what I've
8	reviewed. Just taking a look at Sadan
9	Elizabeth Bibb there are obviously a lot of
10	fingerprints on it.
11	MS. SPIKES: Yes.
12	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Then there's a
12 13	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Then there's a page attached to it that says applicant at the
13	page attached to it that says applicant at the
13	page attached to it that says applicant at the top and then at the bottom it's stamped, "No
13 14 15	page attached to it that says applicant at the top and then at the bottom it's stamped, "No arrest record April 25, 2009."
13 14 15 16	page attached to it that says applicant at the top and then at the bottom it's stamped, "No arrest record April 25, 2009." MS. SPIKES: Yes.
13 14 15 16 17	page attached to it that says applicant at the top and then at the bottom it's stamped, "No arrest record April 25, 2009." MS. SPIKES: Yes. CHAIRPERSON LOUD: That would mean
13 14 15 16 17	page attached to it that says applicant at the top and then at the bottom it's stamped, "No arrest record April 25, 2009." MS. SPIKES: Yes. CHAIRPERSON LOUD: That would mean that for her she was cleared as of April 25.
13 14 15 16 17 18	page attached to it that says applicant at the top and then at the bottom it's stamped, "No arrest record April 25, 2009." MS. SPIKES: Yes. CHAIRPERSON LOUD: That would mean that for her she was cleared as of April 25. MS. SPIKES: Yes.

1	2009, it was just a question of records
2	maintenance?
3	MS. SPIKES: No. When the monitor
4	came out what happened was some of the reports
5	that came back some of them had not returned
6	and then we had copies in the file. As the
7	monitor explained to me, they wanted the
8	original copies in the file because apparently
9	at other centers there had been paperwork
10	taken out of people's actual FBI reports
11	had been removed from their file so they
12	required the originals to be in the file
13	instead of the copy.
14	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
15	MS. SPIKES: Because that way they
16	could see that it was date stamped in the
17	second page. Instead of a Xerox we would
18	actually have the stamp from the FBI.
19	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
20	MS. SPIKES: And then the
21	fingerprint actually has that it's a card
22	that they actually put the fingerprint on.

1	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
2	MS. SPIKES: And so there were a
3	couple of employees where we had the Xerox
4	copy instead of the original in the file and
5	so we were written up for that.
6	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: And then once
7	these background reports are completed that's
8	it.
9	MS. SPIKES: Yes.
10	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: In other words
11	they don't have to be updated annually?
12	MS. SPIKES: No.
13	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
14	MS. SPIKES: It doesn't require
15	that, no.
16	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Some of these
17	are from 2008.
18	MS. SPIKES: Yes.
19	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I want to make
20	sure that we are all on the same page.
21	Normally we probably wouldn't even dig this
22	deep but it's just because of the information

1	that came out of the previous hearing that we
2	have to make sure our record is really full.
3	So then, for example, you're
4	saying now that for Latasha Young that she has
5	a current valid background check?
6	MS. SPIKES: Yes, sir.
7	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: And that's your
8	sworn testimony under oath?
9	MS. SPIKES: Yes, sir.
10	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: And you are
11	saying the same thing for Bronwyn Honesty?
12	MS. SPIKES: Ms. Honesty her FBI
13	clearance has not come back but her police
14	clearance that she's had for you know,
15	we're still waiting on her FBI to return.
16	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. And,
17	again, under oath you're saying that for Gayle
4.0	
18	Tremer she has a clearance?
18	
	Tremer she has a clearance?
19	Tremer she has a clearance? MS. SPIKES: Yes, sir.

actually had her fingerprints done in October
'09 but she is still waiting on her actual
report from the FBI.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
MS. SPIKES: So I attached her
police clearance so that you would know she
originally had a police clearance but we are
now waiting for the FBI.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
MS. SPIKES: In her case the FBI
actually sent her a form to complete about
three weeks ago so we are waiting on her
return.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. But at
least you followed up and you've taken the
steps and you are trying to get the
information back on the FBI.
MS. SPIKES: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: No need to do
this but I just want to go through all of the
ones that you've submitted.

MS. SPIKES: Okay.

1	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Cathy Williams
2	you are saying that you have a proper FBI
3	background check for her?
4	MS. SPIKES: Yes, sir.
5	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. That's
6	your testimony under oath. For Sanitra
7	Haynesworth you have the fact that she's
8	applied for it and you are waiting to get that
9	back.
10	MS. SPIKES: Yes.
11	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. I think
12	we've covered Elizabeth Bibb.
13	MS. SPIKES: Yes.
14	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: You have the
15	clearance for her.
16	MS. SPIKES: Yes, sir.
17	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. For
18	Ranisha Roury?
19	MS. SPIKES: Roury.
20	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. You are
21	waiting for Ranisha Roury.
22	MS. SPIKES: Yes, sir.

1	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. For
2	Patricia Spikes that has come back and has
3	been cleared.
4	MS. SPIKES: Yes.
5	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. I think
6	I understand that part of our record a little
7	bit better. Now, on the immunization piece
8	you have submitted something that says that
9	there is 100 percent compliance with
10	immunization.
11	MS. SPIKES: Yes, sir.
12	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: So it's your
13	testimony under sworn oath here today that
14	this document is evidence of the 100 percent
15	compliance.
16	MS. SPIKES: Yes, sir.
17	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: In fact, it has
18	in the column for overdue zero percent and in
19	the column for compliance it has 100 percent
20	for 34.
21	MS. SPIKES: Yes, sir.
22	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: You do have 39.

1	MS. SPIKES: Yes. We just
2	recently got a couple of new kids.
3	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: So the variance
4	between the 34 compliant and the 39 is that
5	you've got five new kids?
6	MS. SPIKES: Yes, sir. Five new
7	kids. We just got them last week.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: You have five
9	new last week. In terms of the follow-up
10	procedures of planning for those five, what
11	are the actions that are underway?
12	MS. SPIKES: They can't begin day
13	care unless they have their immunizations so
14	they are up to date as of the date that they
15	started. They have to bring in their
16	immunization record from the doctor. Three of
17	the children are infants three months old so
18	they can't. License don't allow you to accept
19	them into your center unless they have
20	immunizations. Two of them are 14 months old
21	so they all have current immunizations.
22	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: So, again, just

1	so I understand it, you're seeking the zoning
2	relief of 39. You have 39. Thirty-four of
3	them you have the documentation for
4	immunizations. The other five they are so
5	recent they have been immunized you just don't
6	have the documentation.
7	MS. SPIKES: No, I have the
8	documentation. They can't enter the center
9	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Is that here?
10	Okay. Is that part of what you submitted for
11	our record?
12	MS. SPIKES: No. What I submitted
13	to you were the children that were already in
14	the center and every year we have to submit
15	their records to the Department of Health.
16	They review it and they are the
17	ones that determine what shots the children
18	would need and then once the children submit
19	the health records to me, then I send it back
20	and they are the ones that determine the
21	percentage that we've met. They are the ones

that sent me the sheet stating that we have

1	the 100 percent at the 34 children. Then we
2	just got the new children last week.
3	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. So it
4	wouldn't be any kind of burden on you to
5	provide us with documentation that those five
6	have been immunized properly.
7	MS. SPIKES: No, sir.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
9	MS. SPIKES: I could have that
10	faxed to your office here if you want.
11	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. For me
12	that would be helpful.
13	MS. SPIKES: Okay.
14	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: The fire
15	inspection approval, okay. I'm clear on that.
16	The staff health certificate I think is
17	something that Mr. Spikes went into in his
18	discussion but I don't see it mentioned in
19	your report. Is it above and beyond what was
20	covered in the report?
21	MR. SPIKES: It wasn't that, Mr.
22	Chairman. It's Ms. Cuthbert. She policed us

1	pretty diligently and she wanted us to be
2	above the requirements of the license and the
3	Board. I mention that because I want to
4	mention anything that the Board may have an
5	interest in and to assure the Board that we
6	are trying to move forward.
7	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Is it
8	the sworn testimony under oath of your
9	witnesses, Mr. Spikes?
10	MR. SPIKES: Yes.
11	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I'm not sure
12	which one would be the appropriate one. That
13	all of the background checks that are required
14	are either completed per this exhibit or in
15	process for this exhibit. Are there any
16	persons that are not covered by what's in this
17	exhibit that would need to have background
18	checks?
19	MS. SPIKES: No, sir.
20	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Then
21	it's your sworn testimony under oath?
22	MS. SPIKES: Yes, sir.

right. Then we have this issue of the parking variance. That's something that came up at the previous hearing. I think OP mentioned it in its report and you have now included it in this filing which is dated March 4. I don't know if you mentioned it before March 4 but I know that it's part of this filing now.

In terms of how we would normally handle that, and I encourage the weigh-in of my colleagues as well, is that typically for the variance relief -- let me back up. If an applicant request variance relief and then during the course of the hearing it becomes apparent that additional special exception relief is necessary or they really need a special exception, not a variance, we will allow them normally to amend on the record and we'll continue forward with the case.

But when an applicant begins with special exception relief and then has a need to amend it to require the greater relief for

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

variance because it's a higher standard, we typically request that they renotice the case requesting the variance relief so that all of the persons that got notice regarding the special exception get notice regarding the variance.

In fact, we have a case very similar to yours this afternoon there that very thing happened. It kind of puts me, perhaps all of us, in a bit of an awkward situation because we have a CDC that had to amend for variance parking relief in an earlier case.

We required them to go through the regular process to do that which is to renotice the case, and we now have your application which has taken into consideration this variance request and it has not been noticed to anybody in the community as a variance case.

MS. CUTHBERT: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1 MS. CUTHBERT: I do want to say on 2 Newcomb Street where this facility is located 3 there is plenty of street parking. 4 CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. 5 MS. CUTHBERT: That's why we did 6 not address the parking. There is a lot of 7 free parking on the street where this facility 8 is located. Thank you. 9 CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Ι 10 think that is very helpful and I think they have also submitted information on the record 11 12 regarding most of the client community walking 13 to the facility and the like. Nonetheless, I 14 think with the advice of my colleagues and 15 perhaps counsel we are going to have to 16 address that issue at some point during the 17 hearing. 18 MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I have a 19 couple of questions. One of the questions I 20 asked initially so I guess, Ms. Spikes, if you 2.1 can address this, was the 13 versus 14 staff.

Do you currently have 14 or 13 staff members?

1	MS. SPIKES: No. Currently we
2	don't have 13 or 14.
3	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: How many
4	staff do you currently have?
5	MS. SPIKES: Currently we have 10
6	because two just recently left.
7	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: So before the
8	two left you would have had 12?
9	MS. SPIKES: Yes.
10	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Okay. So but
11	you are looking for 13 or 14? What is the
12	total number of staff that you are actually
13	looking for in the application?
14	MS. SPIKES: I think previously we
15	asked for 14 because we were anticipating an
16	increase in the number of children is why we
17	asked for 14. That is my recollection is why
18	we had 14 previously.
19	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: So you are
20	currently still then just simply seeking 13,
21	not 14?
22	MS. SPIKES: Yes.

1	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Okay. I just
2	wanted to make sure that we understand the
3	exact number. You said that you have 10 staff
4	members and that two just left.
5	MS. SPIKES: Yes.
6	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: The list that
7	I wrote down from the criminal background
8	checks we only have eight individuals
9	identified under the criminal background
10	check. Who are the additional two individuals
11	that are not in the packet that we have?
12	MS. SPIKES: Angela Jones. She's
13	coming from Queen Street. She's an employee
14	of Newcomb, another facility.
15	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Okay, Ms.
16	Jones.
17	MS. SPIKES: Angela Jones and Kim
18	McCray, also an employee from Newcomb.
19	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Why were
20	there criminal background checks not included
21	in this package?
22	MS. SPIKES: I didn't get their

1	file in time actually to get it over here so
2	I can get it to you. Ms. Jones has worked for
3	Newcomb for four years. Ms. Kim has worked
4	for Newcomb for two years.
5	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: And what
6	location have they worked for?
7	MS. SPIKES: Queen Street. 1235
8	Queen Street, N.E.
9	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Chairman Loud
10	had just asked you a second ago if we had all
11	of the documentation for all the staff members
12	and you said we did in our file. Now that
13	you're saying we don't have two of them, I
14	think we would definitely want to see those
15	additional two.
16	Your current eight staff members,
17	or 10 if we include Jones and McCray, how do
18	they currently get to the site?
19	MS. SPIKES: By bus.
20	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: All of them?
21	MS. SPIKES: All of them except
22	for two. Of the 10 or the eight? Are you

1	asking the eight?
2	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Total eight.
3	I'm sorry, total 10.
4	MS. SPIKES: Of the 10 two drive
5	and eight let's see. Two walk and four
6	catch the bus.
7	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Okay. So
8	then we are still two short. If four take the
9	bus, two walk, two drive.
10	MS. SPIKES: Four, five, six,
11	seven, eight.
12	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: It would be a
13	total of 10, though?
14	MS. SPIKES: Oh, the other two.
15	There's Ms. Jones and Ms. McCray. They both
16	take the bus.
17	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: They take the
18	bus also. Okay. And that includes yourself?
19	MS. SPIKES: Yes.
20	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Okay. So
21	then you only have actually two cars that
22	would require parking on the street?

1	MS. SPIKES: Yes.
2	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Okay. Going
3	back to the immunization form, I'm trying to
4	read it. I guess correct me if my
5	interpretation of this document is incorrect.
6	It says that zero are overdue, 14 were due,
7	and that's, I guess, then that listing below
8	the 14 children and their immunization details
9	so that was kind of an update from a past
10	report. With these 14 that are shown below,
11	that shows that 34 total in compliance?
12	MS. SPIKES: Yes.
13	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Okay. I just
14	wanted to make sure I understood that. Thank
15	you. I think those are all my questions for
16	now. Thank you.
17	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mrs.
18	Moldenhauer. Are there any additional Board
19	questions? Okay. Then why don't we turn to
20	the Office of Planning.
21	MS. THOMAS: Good morning, Mr.

	CHAIRFERSON LOOD. GOOD MOINING.
2	MS. THOMAS: and Members of the
3	Board. Karen Thomas with the Office of
4	Planning. We recommend approval as requested
5	by Newcomb Day Care for staff of 13 and number
6	of students 39 as approved by OSSE so we
7	believe they met the test under their license
8	capacity for 39 students.
9	We also added variance relief for
10	parking which we believe was necessary for
11	this site. I would be happy to take any
12	questions that you may have on those.
13	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you.
14	Just a couple of very quick questions. In
15	your report you recommend several conditions,
16	I think six conditions. Have you heard
17	anything this morning that would change that
18	at all or are you still recommending these six
19	conditions?
20	MS. THOMAS: I'm still
21	recommending the six conditions, yes.
22	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Very

1	well. One of the requirements under let me
2	just back up. So based on the presentation
3	that the applicant has made, and presumably
4	the support that they receive from OSSE you
5	believe that they meet all the requirements of
6	Section 205, the office does?
7	MS. THOMAS: That's correct.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. And
9	under 205.2 the criteria is that the center or
10	facility shall be capable of meeting all
11	applicable code and licensing requirements.
12	Does OP believe that they can meet that?
13	MS. THOMAS: Yes, I do, under
14	their license capacity.
15	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Under
16	the 39.
17	MS. THOMAS: Yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: And your
19	conclusion is based on what?
20	MS. THOMAS: OSSE's report that
21	was provided, the testimony that was provided
22	by the applicant in terms of correcting all

1	the deficiencies.
2	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
3	MS. THOMAS: As well as the past
4	OSSE report that they indeed have a license
5	capacity for 39.
6	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. The
7	testimony this morning is that they are short
8	five immunizations and that there are at least
9	two background criminal checks that Mrs.
10	Moldenhauer was able to draw out that are not
11	part of the record. Notwithstanding those
12	deficiencies is it still the conclusion of the
13	Office of Planning that they meet Section
14	205.2?
15	MS. THOMAS: That's correct.
16	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. In
17	Section 205.3 the criteria relates to traffic
18	conditions and the like and, of course, we now
19	have this issue of the variance for the
20	parking. Does the Office of Planning believe
21	that there are no adverse traffic impacts?
22	MS. THOMAS: Yes. Having visited

1	that area several times at different times of
2	the day.
3	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. They've
4	been there since 1992. Right?
5	MS. THOMAS: Yes.
6	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: And we don't
7	have any witnesses here
8	MS. THOMAS: To testify.
9	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: objecting
10	regarding adverse traffic impacts.
11	MS. THOMAS: That's correct, yes.
12	As I said, I did visit this facility at
13	different times of the day just to look at the
14	situation with respect to traffic and really
15	and truly it is lesser parking and I didn't
16	see anything to cause concern.
17	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Under
18	205.6 it authorizes the Board to make special
19	treatment by way of design, screening and the
20	like. I think at one point, correct me if I'm
21	wrong, OP had recommended something other than
22	a chain link fence?

1	MS. THOMAS: Yes. At one time,
2	yes.
3	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Is that still
4	on the table?
5	MS. THOMAS: No.
6	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
7	MS. THOMAS: It's just a sense of
8	aesthetics but not necessary.
9	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Again, some of
10	the cases that we are able to rest on the
11	record. I think in other cases we really have
12	to make sure that we have a full record that
13	supports whatever decision we make. Under
14	Section 205.7 off-site play areas have to be
15	located such that there is no potential for
16	endangerment to the young people. Is that
17	Office of Planning
18	MS. THOMAS: We were satisfied
19	that where they go to play was sufficiently
20	safe and access to that didn't present any
21	safety concerns to us.
22	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Final

1	question. Is there anything in the
2	presentation of the applicant, the testimony
3	that has come out this morning, the reports
4	that are part of the application that would
5	give OP pause to recommend approval of this
6	application? Anything.
7	MS. THOMAS: I wouldn't say give
8	me pause but I would just say where they were
9	deficient in presenting those two background
10	checks if they could submit it to the Office
11	of Zoning in a timely manner before the order
12	is released that would be helpful so at least
13	we could have a full record as far as those
14	go.
15	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: So the
16	background checks. Do you feel the same way
17	about the immunizations or is it just the
18	background checks?
19	MS. THOMAS: Just the background
20	checks.
21	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. I don't
22	have any additional questions. Let's see if

1	other Board Members do.
2	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: One of the
3	comments that was in the prior case from OSSE
4	was some of the condition aspects of the
5	property. In the applicant's recent
6	submission on Exhibit 30 they indicate that
7	they have taken lengths to repaint and to
8	improve the property.
9	I think also in the ANC's report
10	they say that they have done that. Can you
11	testify as to, I guess, the improvements or
12	maybe if there is any current areas that are
13	potentially subpar in regards to the interior
14	or the existing area?
15	MS. THOMAS: I really can't. I
16	have to be honest I did not go inside the
17	facility as to where they did make
18	improvements to the interior but I can only
19	see from the pictures that was presented. I
20	mean, I don't have any issues with it.
21	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Okay.

MS. THOMAS: Since they did any

1	renovations I haven't been.
2	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: You have not
3	been inside?
4	MS. THOMAS: Not inside.
5	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Okay. Thank
6	you.
7	MS. CUTHBERT: May I make a
8	comment, Ms. Moldenhauer? Originally when
9	they first came before the ANC I told you how
10	I felt. I'm a very particular person when it
11	comes to our children. They have really truly
12	cleaned up the whole building. I have to say
13	it's a 110 percent difference so I am pleased
14	when you walk into the day care.
15	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Thank you
16	very much. I was going to ask you that
17	question when you presented your testimony in
18	a few minutes but thank you for that
19	statement.
20	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: There are no
21	questions from the Board for the Office of
22	Planning. Did the applicant have any

1	questions for the Office of Planning?
2	MR. SPIKES: No, sir.
3	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Then we
4	can go right where you were heading,
5	Commissioner Cuthbert, and get to the ANC
6	report which we do have as our Exhibit 28.
7	MS. CUTHBERT: Good morning,
8	Chairman Loud, and BZA Board commissioners.
9	I'm Mary Cuthbert. I'm the Chair for Advisory
10	Neighbor Commission 8C and Single Member
11	District 8C-03.
12	I have to say about this facility,
13	in the first place, I constantly stayed on top
14	of them to make sure that they had every
15	document that you said was not in that first
16	case. That was one thing. I want them to
17	make sure everything is in there, all the
18	reports, the fire marshall would be there, the
19	superintendent's report, the fingerprints, all
20	that. I told them, "I'm not coming back down
21	if you don't have everything in order."

I went and visited the facility

again to make sure it was still maintained, it wasn't just something thinking that I'm going to come by and you are going to have everything in order. I did a surprise visit and I'm really pleased.

I have to say that I told my

fellow commissioners they have made a real 110

percent improvement on the interior building

of appearance. Now, as far as the educational

part I'm not going to go into that. I get too

involved but as far as the appearance and how

the kids are being taken care of that I seen

it's a great improvement. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you,

Commissioner. Thank you for working in your

capacity as a chair of the ANC working with

the applicant to raise some of the -- I don't

want to say raise the standard but to help

them comply with some of what has been placed

on the record and thank the applicant for

working with the ANC as well.

MR. SPIKES: Mr. Chairman, she

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	raised the standard. That's an accurate
2	statement.
3	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I stand
4	corrected then. Do you have any questions for
5	the Commissioner? Okay.
6	Board Members? It doesn't appear
7	such. There is no one in the audience so no
8	one is here to testify and support our
9	position so then we turn back to the applicant
10	for closing remarks.
11	MR. SPIKES: Mr. Chairman, we
12	appreciate your tolerance in allowing us to
13	present our case. I think we have done the
14	best we could here in presenting the case and
15	what we needed to do to make this
16	presentation.
17	The only request that I have in
18	addition to the request that we be approved is
19	that we get a C of O that could be extended
20	into the distant future. It's not that we
21	don't like coming here to see you. We think

you're a wonderful group of people but we

would like to see you as infrequently as we possibly could. If I'm not too far in the future, I humbly request a five-year C of O.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Spikes. I think we probably need to leave the record open for a couple things and probably would not be prepared to deliberate on the case until we received or did not receive those things.

Rather than suggest we deliberate on this this morning, although I think the application as a number of strong points in it, I would like to suggest to colleagues that we leave the record open for submission of the documentation on the status of background checks for, I believe, it was Ms. Kim and Ms. Jones, as well as for the documentation for the completed immunizations for the five students that are not part of our record. Presumably if that can be submitted to OZ in the next couple of days, we could set this for a decision next Tuesday.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman,
2	just a question. How are we going to address
3	the parking variance? I think for the sake of
4	consistency with other cases you raised the
5	point earlier that we may need to renotice
6	this.
7	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Let me tell you
8	my thoughts on it and then let me tell you
9	that I also want to follow the law. Whatever
10	the law requires that we do is what I would
11	like to follow. Given the presence of the ANC
12	in this issue throughout, I mean, this is not
13	a surprise in that community because
14	Commissioner Cuthbert was a part of the
15	earlier case and part of this case.
16	Some of the testimony from
17	Commissioner Cuthbert regarding the lack of
18	adverse impacts to parking through the
19	variance I would be open to any legal
20	interpretation that would not require us to

I would in that vein before

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

renotice the case.

21

supporting a condition that if we were to approve it that everyone within 200 feet of the applicant's property receive notification, sort of post the fact that we granted that variance relief from one parking space because I think that all things being considered it sounds like the community has been very involved in this particular child development project since at least 1992.

It's been there a long time. I
think we would have heard more about adverse
impacts if there were actually going to be
some. That is sort of just like a layman's
approach to problem solving. Again, I would
be for following the law and being consistent
so if there is no way to get around that, then
I would be for us doing what we have to do and
bite the bullet.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask a question and maybe somebody is more familiar with the past cases but if this the first time that the relief for the

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	parking requirement is being explicitly
2	discussed? Was it not addressed in the prior
3	ones at all?
4	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: It was
5	addressed. It was noted in both the past case
6	by OP. I think the reality is that while
7	potentially lack of any past, I guess,
8	concerns of neighbors is important but then
9	there is also the issue of the fact that this
10	center has been in noncompliance for many,
11	many years.
12	I think that in regards to
13	following some of our past cases and what we
14	have done in past situations this is a higher
15	standard that is being requested that has not
16	been noticed. Chairman Loud and I have
17	discussed this. I think that while, yes, the

I think there may be no additional

I think this issue may not have been

specifically addressed.

ANC has been involved in the issue and the

commissioner is here presenting her opinion,

NEAL R. GROSS

18

19

20

1	issues but I think that the law requires us to
2	provide notice on it and provide neighbors an
3	opportunity to see the posting specifically
4	regarding parking and then address that.
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Another
6	question I have what is the current status?
7	Is the order that's already in place going to
8	expire imminently of is that stayed while we
9	have an application in process? Maybe that's
10	a legal question.
11	MS. NAGELHOUT: The past order
12	expires they were approved in March of 2005
13	for three years so it's been expired for a
14	while. They did file an application last year
15	after the prior approval had already expired.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: So it's already
17	beyond any approval and they are operating
18	without.
19	MR. SPIKES: No, no, no. We have
20	a temporary C of O.
21	MS. NAGELHOUT: But they don't
22	have a special exception. Parking was

1 addressed in 1997. One of the conditions of 2 approval was that they would provide two on-3 site parking spaces. I don't know that ever 4 happened. The 2005 approval required them to 5 provide one on-site parking space and I don't 6 know if that ever happened. 7 I think prior to that their staff 8 was small enough so that parking wasn't an 9 issue but as the number of kids has grown over 10 the years, the number of employees has grown. 11 At some point it became an issue. 12 COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, 13 all this points to the thought that we need to 14 be, I think, very explicit in granting the 15 relief to the variance request. I think 16 honestly it should be noticed once again. 17 I don't quite understand their 18 current legal status and the temporary C of O 19 and what that means without a special 20 exception in place but if they are already

NEAL R. GROSS

operating without all the approvals that they

need, what difference does it make if we

2.1

1	decide it next week versus next month. Let's
2	get the notice out there and then act with all
3	the information. That's my thought.
4	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Board Member
5	Sorg, did you want to weigh in on this
6	discussion?
7	MEMBER SORG: Yes. I just wanted
8	to make an observation. I have not been here
9	on this Board that long but I can observe in
10	all of the CDC cases that I have sat on each
11	one has had some kind of discussion or issue
12	around parking and in general has required, I
13	think, the variances.
14	It seems to me that it would be
15	important to be inconsistent on this issue and
16	make sure that the people that are coming to
17	this Board with these kinds of requests know
18	that they are likely to run into the parking
19	issues and that they should address that
20	before they come here.
21	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: In my gut there
22	is something about it that it doesn't sit

right because we are having a case just this afternoon on this same issue where we made them go out and we made them comply with the notice requirements.

Part of me wants to figure out a way to fix it and make it work but really that is not the Board's responsibility. This is something that we raised over and over again in previous matters and it's something that OP raised in the previous hearing that's in their reports that there is a need to request parking relief.

MS. SPIKES: Mr. Chair --

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I think -- hold on one second. I think one option would probably be this is self-certified to grant the relief. The applicant runs the risk of still not getting the C of O because it does not meet the parking requirement which I think is what we would have to do if the applicant does not amend this application.

On the other hand, the applicant

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

ı	
1	appears to me to have amended the application.
2	I don't want to belabor this but it just
3	doesn't sit right to require one applicant to
4	follow the process and to allow a different
5	applicant to completely go around the process.
6	Yes.
7	MS. SPIKES: Mr. Chairman, it's
8	probably out of my ignorance not knowing. I'm
9	the one that did this report and I did not
10	give it to Mr. Spikes or Ms. Cannon before it
11	was submitted. When I was typing up and
12	trying to respond to these issues, I put in
13	the issue regarding the parking because it was
14	also in the report from Office of Planning.
15	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: You're talking
16	about the March 4th report?
17	MS. SPIKES: Yes, sir. The March
18	4th report. I just included that in there
19	just to let you know that most of the
20	employees do walk or catch the bus.
21	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Again, if by
22	saying that you're saying that you are not

1	requesting parking
2	MS. SPIKES: I'm saying I didn't
3	do it as a request. I just was addressing the
4	issue because it was in the report that we got
5	from planning.
6	MR. SPIKES: But if I may, Mr.
7	Chairman.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Yes, Mr.
9	Spikes.
10	MR. SPIKES: I am of the opinion
11	honestly that the issue of parking as far as
12	the memo dated February 1, 2005, when the
13	District of Columbia Department of
14	Transportation that we had well established
15	that our intent to provide parking spaces in
16	the back yard could not be fully realized
17	because of the shape of the back yard and also
18	the condition of the alleyway.
19	Environmentally it would have been
20	unadvantageous for us to do that. I think the
21	Department of Transportation recognized that.
22	We tried to be as open as we possibly can to

address that here and to not go under the radar. I will say to you relative to the parking is that the building is approximately 30 to 40 feet wide and with that being the case there's provision for two cars there.

If we had community parking at least we would have provisions for two cars.

If we walk down the street we would see a building the back of which is facing Newcomb

Street in the front. The forefront is Malcolm

X Avenue and that particular area there is always inevitably vacant for parking.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I don't want to cut you off but you are making really great arguments that go to the merits of the relief.

What Mr. May and the other Board Members are talking about is the process, the procedure.

In order to earn that kind of relief you have to provide notice to the community that you are seeking that kind of relief and that is the step that didn't happen in your case.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	In order for us to proceed
2	forward, if you have amended your application
3	to include variance relief, which the Office
4	of Planning has recommended now, there are
5	several iterations of this case that you do,
6	if that is your relief that you're seeking,
7	we're going to have to notice the case for
8	variance relief which would mean, and I always
9	get the calculations a little off, there's
10	probably another
11	How many days before this case
12	could come back?
13	MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, it
14	depends. Are you asking for it to be put in
15	the D.C. Register or are you just asking for
16	notice to be sent to persons within a 1,200
17	foot radius?
18	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I think to be
19	safe whatever we did in the Kimmell case, the
20	regular way we notice these cases is what we
21	should do in this case.

Mr. Moy, you were --

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MR. MOY: What we did in the
2	Kimmell case was we noticed the appropriate
3	amount which is 40 days.
4	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Forty days. To
5	Ms. Bailey's question, was it just the 200
6	feet, or was it to the ANC and to all of the
7	list of
8	MR. MOY: It was a full
9	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Full. Okay.
10	To answer your question, Ms. Bailey, it would
11	be the full notification requirements and I
12	think Mr. Moy's estimate is that it would be
13	about 40 days minimum.
14	MS. BAILEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
15	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
16	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Mr. Chair, it
17	brings up a question and I don't know how we
18	want to deal with it. I have two different
19	views on this but right now they are operating
20	really legally with an expired C of O that
21	expired in December of '09. Their OSSE
22	license doesn't expire until March 22nd of

	this year so in about two weeks.
2	If we require the 40-day notice,
3	which I strongly think we have to based on
4	past cases as I've just said, I don't know how
5	they can continue to operate. I don't know
6	what OSSE's policy is, if they provide
7	temporary licenses for a period of time, if
8	they would stay the expiration until this case
9	is determined. I don't know the answer to
10	that but I throw that out as an issue of
11	concern that we probably need to think about
12	and discuss.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: You mentioned a
14	temporary C of O. Can you explain what you

MR. SPIKES: Yes. We have a C of O that will expire, I think, in July. To Ms. Moldenhauer's statement, I appreciate your concern and appreciate very much you bringing it to the attention of the expiration of the license.

In that vein I would ask the Board

NEAL R. GROSS

have?

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	would you be willing to recommend continuation
2	of the day care until such time you are able
3	to make a decision on the parking. We are
4	here today primarily dealing with the
5	substantive aspect of the day care center
6	relative to the best interest of the children
7	and also to the safety concerns.
8	Parking is tangential to that. We
9	attest to that fact to the extent that the day
10	care has been there for close to 14 years and
11	we have never had a person in the community to
12	complain about parking or lack of parking.
13	I think it would have a totally
14	adverse affect on the community without cause
15	to just continue the day care existence
16	because we have a parking problem. That would
17	be like saying that we have to close the
18	District building here because we don't have
19	parking and the subway system is closed.
20	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Well, I have a
21	couple of thoughts in response to that. We

don't have a real problem. If your temporary

1	C of O expires July 20, '10 and we're talking
2	about an additional 40 days notice, those 40
3	days would expire well before July 20, '10 and
4	we can set the case for decision the first
5	Tuesday after the expiration of the 40 days.
6	It would not be a situation of the
7	young people being forced out onto the streets
8	and so on and so forth. The expiration of the
9	OSSE license would not be an issue of zoning.
10	That would just be your issue with OSSE.
11	Obviously any enforcement issues would not be
12	an issue of zoning either.
13	That would be the ZA's issue. If
14	you've got a C of O that will take you to July
15	20, '10, unless I'm missing something, forty
16	days plus from now schedule it for decision.
17	You would have a decision one way or the other
18	before it expires in July of 2010.
19	MR. SPIKES: The only thing I
20	would require, Mr. Chairman, is any
21	guidelines, any requirements that you may have

for us to meet because I definitely want to be

1 on the target bulls eye, no exceptions. 2 CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Just quickly 3 for me, I think working with the Office of 4 Planning they are extremely familiar with this 5 variance test and the criteria that has to be 6 I think they probably would be willing 7 to work with you on that and just make sure 8 that you have the evidence in the record to 9 meet each of the elements of the test. 10 have spoken a little about it already with the 11 DDOT report and so on. 12 MS. THOMAS: I think what he needs 13 to understand is the process. I think he needs to understand that he has to go through 14 15 the Office of Zoning and what, in effect, 16 amending the application really means. I 17 think that is where he is having a problem. 18 CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. 19 COMMISSIONER MAY: We have talked 20 about having to do a new notice but until you 2.1 amend the application, they can't do the new

NEAL R. GROSS

notice.

1	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I understand.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: If you can get
3	that in today or tomorrow, then we can start
4	the 40-day clock.
5	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: He can amend on
6	the record, though. Right?
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't know.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: We've done that
9	before. I mean, you can just amend on the
10	record. You can go on the record right now
11	and say, "We hereby amend our application to
12	seek variance relief." Then what you are
13	going to have to do you are going to have to
14	supplement that with some filing where you
15	articulate the criteria for the variance test
16	and how it's met.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think we need
18	to make sure the Office of Zoning staff is
19	paying attention when he does repeat it and
20	they are engaged in that conversation right
21	now.
	1

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Yes.

22

Again,

1	just to reiterate that, you can amend on the
2	record. We've had a number of cases where
3	there has been an amendment on the record and
4	you can just state on the record if you are
5	amending your application to incorporate a
6	request for variance relief for the parking.
7	The key thing would be the follow-up. I'll
8	defer to some of the OZ staff just in case
9	there are some other particular things that
10	are required to formally amend.
11	MS. BAILEY: No, Mr. Chairman.
12	The only thing the applicant has to do is to
13	say specifically that they request the
14	amendment to include the parking.
15	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
16	MR. SPIKES: Thank you, Mr.
17	Chairman. I respectfully request the
18	amendment to the application to include
19	parking.
20	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Very well. I
21	think in terms of the Office of Planning can
22	they work with your office in terms of the

1	area variance test and the criteria that they
2	need to meet that?
3	MS. THOMAS: Yes, we would be
4	happy to help them. They can use our report
5	as an example of how they need to answer the
6	variance test and I would happily send you the
7	criteria for Section 3103 so you can answer
8	those questions.
9	MR. SPIKES: Thank you very much.
10	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you.
11	Is there further?
12	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I just wanted
13	to articulate the documents that we would need
14	not associated with the parking but in regards
15	to the actual CDC application. That would
16	need to be submitted so that we can make a
17	final decision on that portion of the case.
18	The Jones and McCray criminal
19	background checks and if Roury or
20	Haynesworth's background checks come back I'll
21	obviously include those. That would be
22	important, too. I think Chairman Loud had

1	indicated that he would like the immunization
2	documentation for the additional two or four
3	children that are new.
4	I would like a copy of the current
5	we have a reference of it. We have the old
6	C of O but we don't have the new C of O that
7	is referenced that expires on July 31, 2010 so
8	those would be the documents that we would be
9	looking to get that we would leave the record
10	open for unless there is any additional
11	documentation that any other Board Members
12	have.
13	MR. SPIKES: Thank you.
14	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I think the
15	fifth one that I would add to that, and I
16	
	think we talked about it, is just the briefing
17	think we talked about it, is just the briefing on the pleading that briefs how you make the
17 18	
	on the pleading that briefs how you make the
18	on the pleading that briefs how you make the area variance test.
18 19	on the pleading that briefs how you make the area variance test. MR. SPIKES: Yes, sir.

1	MS. BAILEY: Mr. Moy, are you
2	doing that?
3	MR. MOY: Excuse me. I would
4	suggest, Mr. Chairman, that given the time
5	frame we could shoot for either Tuesday, April
6	27, or May 5th depending on when the applicant
7	files with respect to the 40 to 45 days.
8	MR. SPIKES: We intend to do it
9	expeditiously.
10	MR. MOY: So today?
11	MR. SPIKES: Well, I would hope so
12	but other factors come into play.
13	MR. MOY: In that case, I think to
14	ensure enough time I'm looking at April the
15	27th.
16	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: April the 27th.
17	I think that is obviously fine with me. Mr.
18	May, if you're not back with us you can do an
19	absentee.
20	I think April 27th looks like it
21	will work. You've indicated that the four
22	things that Mrs. Moldenhauer mentioned you can

1	have very expeditiously. That is the
2	background checks, the immunization follow-up,
3	the temporary C of O. Why don't we give you
4	a deadline of two weeks for that.
5	MR. SPIKES: Yes, sir. That would
6	be fine.
7	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Two weeks from
8	today for that. Then for the pleading how
9	about a couple of weeks in front of the
10	hearing.
11	MR. SPIKES: That would be great.
12	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
13	MR. MOY: Mr. Chairman, just one
14	other thing. I'm just recalling that I don't
15	believe we are going to have a hearing
16	scheduled for April 27th which would leave May
17	the 4th.
18	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Let's
19	not probably have a special hearing just for
20	that. We'll take it now to May the 4th so two
21	weeks backed up from May 4th is the deadline

for your pleading on the area variance and

1	still two weeks from today is the deadline for
2	the four categories of documents that Board
3	Member Moldenhauer mentioned.
4	MR. SPIKES: Thank you.
5	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Is there
6	anything further, Board Members, on this case?
7	There doesn't appear to be. Anything further
8	from the Office of the Attorney General on it?
9	Okay. From OZ staff? Okay. Then I think we
10	can adjourn this case. Thank you. We look
11	forward to the follow-up in April.
12	Do we have anything further on
13	this morning's calendar, Ms. Bailey?
14	MS. BAILEY: No, Mr. Chairman.
15	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Then
16	we're going to adjourn and perhaps we are
17	going to start the afternoon sessions. Is
18	1:15 okay for Board Members, a 45-minute lunch
19	break? Okay. We'll start at 1:15 with the
20	afternoon cases. We're adjourned.
21	(Whereupon, at 12:36 p.m. off the
22	record for lunch until 1:54 p.m.)

2.1

A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N

1:54 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: This hearing will please come to order. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. This is the March 9th public hearing of the Board of Zoning Adjustment of the District of Columbia.

My name is Marc Loud, Chairperson, and joining me today is Mr. Peter May from the Zoning Commission; Mrs. Meridith Moldenhauer, Ms. Nickie Sorg, Mayoral Appointees to the BZA; Mr. Clifford Moy, Secretary of the BZA; Ms. Mary Nagelhout, Attorney in the Office of the Attorney General; and Ms. Beverley Bailey, to my far left, Zoning Specialist here in the Office of Zoning.

Copies of today's hearing agenda are available to you and are located to my left in the wall bin near the door. Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live.

Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in the hearing room.

When presenting information to the Board, please turn on and speak into the microphone first stating your name and home address. When you are finished speaking, please turn your microphone off so that your microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.

application are to fill out two witness cards.

These cards are located to my left on the table near the door and on the witness tables.

Upon coming forward to speak to the Board, please give both cards to the reporter sitting to my right.

The order of procedure for special exceptions and variances is statement and witnesses of the applicant; government reports including the Office of Planning, the

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

Department of Public Works, etc.; the report of the Advisory Neighborhood Commission; parties or persons in support; parties or persons in opposition; and, finally, closing remarks by the applicant only.

Pursuant to Sections 3117.4 and 3117.5 the following time constraints will be maintained. The applicant, the appellant, persons and parties except an ANC in support, including witnesses are allowed to up to 60 minutes collectively.

Appellees, persons, and parties
except an ANC in opposition including
witnesses are allowed up to 60 minutes
collectively. All individuals either opposing
or supporting the application are allowed
three minutes. Individuals representing
organizations are allowed up to five minutes.

These time constraints do not include cross examination and/or questions from the Board. Cross examination of witnesses is also permitted by the applicant

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

or parties only. The ANC within which the property is located is automatically a party in a special exception or a variance case.

Nothing prohibits the Board from placing reasonable restrictions on cross examination.

The record will be closed at the conclusion of each case except for any material specifically requested by the Board. The Board and the staff will specify at the end of the hearing exactly what is expected and the date when the parties must submit the evidence to the Office of Zoning. After the record is closed no other information will be accepted by the Board.

The decision of the Board in these contested cases must be based exclusively on the public record. To avoid any appearance to the contrary the Board request that persons resent not engage the members of the Board in conversation. Please turn off all beepers and cell phones at this time so as not to disrupt this proceedings.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	The Board in all likelihood is
2	going to conclude this afternoon's public
3	hearings well before 6:00 p.m. but if for some
4	reason we don't at 6:00 p.m. we will assess
5	whether we can complete the pending case or
6	cases remaining on the agenda and, if not,
7	reschedule them to the first available date on
8	the calendar.
9	At this time the Board will
10	consider any preliminary matters. Preliminary
11	matters are those that relate to whether a
12	case will or should be heard today such as a
13	request for postponement, continuance, or
14	withdrawal, or whether proper and adequate
15	notice of the hearing has been given.
16	If you are not prepared to go
17	forward with the case today or if you believe
18	that the Board should not proceed, now is the
19	time to raise such a matter.
20	Does the staff have any
21	preliminary matters?

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, Members

1	of the Board, and to everyone good afternoon.
2	Mr. Chairman, one of the cases, Jardin'
3	Infantil, Application 17987 is on the docket
4	for this afternoon. We have not heard from
5	the applicant, as far as I know anyway,
6	concerning its postponement. It is scheduled
7	for today and we don't have adequate
8	information in the record for this case to be
9	heard at this time.
0	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Ms.
1	Bailey. I think what we should do is call up
2	those witnesses that are going to be
3	testifying this afternoon so we can get them
4	sworn in and then we can proceed on with the
5	calendar including the El Jardin' case.
6	MS. BAILEY: Thank you. All those
7	persons wishing to testify would you please
8	stand to take the oath. All persons wishing
9	to testify would you please raise your right
0	hand. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that
1	the testimony that you will be giving today

will be the truth, the whole truth, and

1	nothing but the truth?
2	WITNESSES: I do.
3	MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, it's my
4	understanding that you are going to take the
5	Infantil case up at this time so I should call
6	the case?
7	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I think we are.
8	No, no. Is that El Jardin'?
9	MS. BAILEY: Yes, sir.
10	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Sorry. Yes,
11	we're going to take that case up first.
12	MS. BAILEY: Application No. 17987
13	of El Jardin' Infantil, pursuant to 11 DCMR
14	Section 3104.1 for a special exception to
15	allow a child development center, 12 children
16	and two staff, under Section 205 at premises
17	2108 48th Street, N.W. It is zoned R-1-B and
18	the property is located in Square 1390, Lot
19	825.
20	Just briefly, Mr. Chairman, this
21	is the second time a hearing has been
22	scheduled on this case

1	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Ms.
2	Bailey. If the parties are here for that
3	case, would they please step forward? Just
4	let the record reflect that there are no
5	parties present for that case.
6	I think from what I understand
7	there may have been a misunderstanding about
8	today's hearing date. Without passing
9	judgment on that one way or the other I think
10	there is an opportunity for us to postpone
11	this case and make it really clear to the
12	applicant what gaps there are in the record in
13	preparation for the new date which I think is
14	going to be May 4 at 9:30 a.m.
15	That will be the new hearing date.
16	I would like to turn to Board Member
17	Moldenhauer to really indicate for the
18	applicant what we are going to need in this
19	record to push forward on May 4th.
20	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Thank you,
21	Chairman Loud. Right now the Office of

Planning is unable to provide an analysis or

their opinion on this case because they are lacking a significant documentation. This is the same as was the case back in November.

The applicant needs to make sure that 14 days prior to the May 4th hearing that they provide OP and our office with the following information. One, whether or not the applicant will continue to reside on site.

Two, comments on this proposal from the OSSE office. An explanation of where the 12 children will be dropped off and picked up and how this process would be managed.

Information that would also provide a basis for DDOT to provide comments.

And, fourth, that they provide proposed number of center employees, how the staff is anticipated to arrive to work, whether they are coming via Metro, driving, or walking, and the location of off-street parking resources referenced in the application. All this information is required and will allow us to make a decision on the

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

case.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you,
Board Member Moldenhauer. So based on the
information that you have identified and our
saying that we are going to look at May 4 at
the continuation date, if we could flag two
weeks before May 4 as the deadline for
submission of that information from the
applicant.
MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Yes.
MR. JACKSON: Arthur Jackson, D.C.
Office of Planning. Just one clarification.
In looking at the file there was a response
from the Office of the
MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: OSSE?
MR. JACKSON: Yes that did
support 12 students on the site. That is an
update that we provided in our supplemental
report but we haven't heard anything else from
the applicant. My understanding is the

applicant has not gone back to the ANC to make

1	a presentation there either.
2	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: So then on or
3	before April 20, which would be two weeks
4	prior to May 4, the applicant needs to have
5	previously gone to the ANC, met with them,
6	represented their interest, and then provide
7	us with all except for there will be three
8	items that they will need to provide us with.
9	Whether or not they will reside on the
10	premises, the drop off and pickup of the
11	children, and the number of staff and their
12	access to and from work.
13	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you.
14	Thank you, Mr. Jackson.
15	Is there anything further in this
16	case?
17	MS. BAILEY: Not from me, Mr.
18	Chairman.
19	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Then why
20	don't we move onto the next case and, as
21	indicated, calendar this for the 4th and look
22	forward to seeing the applicant at that time.

1	MS. BAILEY: The next case is
2	Application 18044, Rock Creek Market, LLC,
3	pursuant to 11 DCMR Section 3103.2, for a
4	variance from the use provisions to allow the
5	sale of prepared food at an existing grocery
6	store under Subsection 330.5, at premises 644
7	through 646 Rock Creek Church Road, N.W.,
8	Square 3034, Lot 809. The property is zoned
9	R-4.
10	Excuse me. Did you file an
11	affidavit of posting on this property?
12	Affidavit of posting. Did you file one?
13	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: When responding
14	to Ms. Bailey if you wouldn't mind speaking
15	into the microphone. Just cut it on.
16	MS. SHEWANGEZAW: I'm sorry. What
17	is that?
18	MS. BAILEY: I'm sorry, Mr.
19	Chairman. I kind of blurted that out. We did
20	not receive an affidavit of posting for this
21	property so I'll turn it over to you.
22	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Why

1	don't we do this. Are there any other
2	preliminaries on this case and we can try to
3	address them all at the same time.
4	MS. BAILEY: Not from me, sir.
5	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. The
6	affidavit of posting is one of the
7	requirements that we have in our regulations
8	so that persons who live in your surrounding
9	community get notice of the request for relief
10	so typically you would have to post the
11	property to let individuals know.
12	Posting is putting a big sign on
13	the property to let them know of the requested
14	relief. Then you would have to come into the
15	Office of Zoning and submit an affidavit that
16	you have posted the property. What Ms. Bailey
17	is saying is that the affidavit is not part of
18	our record.
19	MS. SHEWANGEZAW: I wasn't aware
20	of doing that but I did collect 55 signatures
21	from the area residents letting them know that

I have this hearing today. Would that make a

difference?

2.1

make a difference. I think we've got also in our record at our Exhibit 24 and I think

Exhibit 9 some neighbors that know about it obviously and have gone on record supporting it. Is that what you're talking about, the Parkview United Neighborhood Coalition and some of the individual neighbors that have supported the project?

MS. SHEWANGEZAW: Yes.

addition to that we take some other steps to make sure that the community finds out about it. For example, through the Office of Zoning send out an attestation letter that goes out under the director's signature. Here in this case it was Exhibit 23.

It goes to all persons that live within 200 feet of the applicant's property.

We also publish it in, I believe, the D.C.

Register. I think based on the presentation

1	and the package put together for us it's
2	pretty clear that the community knows about
3	it. I think there is good reason that we can
4	waive that requirement under Section 3100.5.
5	Do Board Members have any
6	additional thoughts on that?
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Just for the
8	sake of consistency. In the past when a lack
9	of posting have come up I have generally been
10	opposed to proceeding without the posting
11	occurring on the principle that we have these
12	different methods of notifying the public
13	intended to reach different people
14	individually.
15	We mail to people who are in close
16	proximity. We notify the ANC so that they
17	know because they may not be within 200 feet.
18	Then we post the property so that the people
19	who are walking by who may well be affected by
20	this but don't live in the area and don't go
21	to ANC meetings are also aware of this change.

NEAL R. GROSS

Given the particular circumstances

of this case I'm not terribly troubled by the prospect since it doesn't seem that there is any significant resistance that has already come as a result.

I also know that depending on how we act today it may be a mute point. Given those considerations, I guess I'm okay but generally speaking I would like to see that things are posted.

to the wise. Did you understand Mr. May's remarks? Okay. Very well. If there are no other preliminary matters, we can probably move straight into what we are here to address.

I'll start us off. I understand
the requested relief as been identified as a
use variance. I think that's based on
information that may have been received from
the zoning administrator. As I understand it,
you currently operate a grocery store. You
have a C of O for grocery/prepackaged use and

2.1

that's our Exhibit 10.

2.1

Apparently all you are seeking to do is to add hot beverages -- I'm assuming that's tea and coffee -- donuts, cold and hot -- I hope I'm pronouncing this correctly -- panini sandwiches, and that's it. Is there anything additional that is not in the record that you would be planning to add?

Okay. Well, from my vantage

point, and I'll open it up to other Board

Members, we've had a case very similar to

yours very recently. It was the Jong case.

I don't have the case number readily

available.

I think Mr. May does and he can mention it when he speaks but this case is very, very similar to that case in that we talked about the evolution of grocery stores and with the evolution of the practice of operating a grocery store there has also been an evolution in the definition of what a grocery store is.

We no longer view, at least in that case, where the principle use is a grocery store having these incidental offerings to the community of hot beverages, danish, donuts. I think in that case it was hot dogs and in your case it's hot and cold panini sandwiches, as a separate use or as an accessory use. It's just an incidental part of really running a grocery store in the modern era.

So for that reason in the previous case we dismissed the case under the rationale that relief was not required from us; that the operator had as a matter of right the privilege of adding those additional offerings to their inventory.

I pretty much see this case lining up the same way so I'm not certain that you actually need relief. I think that is what Mr. May alluded to when he said it might be moot as to whether you posted an affidavit.

If I'm correct and you don't need

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

relief, then by dismissal what we would be saying to you and to the zoning administrator is that you can add these very limited specific things that you mentioned in your application without fear that you are not in compliance with the zone. Okay?

Let me see how other Board Members feel and perhaps we can hear from the Office of Planning and then we'll proceed as appropriate.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Chairman

Loud, I agree with your analysis. I think

that Jong does apply here. As we said in

another recent case, the definition is not

defined in the regs for a grocery store and,

thus, you know, we're taking that initial case

and following the logic there which states

that the industry is expanding and that while

these additional uses are then part of the

principle use so long as they are subordinate

to that primary traditional concept of a

grocery.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I would mention for the Jong case the Case No. of that was 17906. I will also just make a couple of comments about the idea of accessory use and whether the sale of prepared food falls under the definition of a grocery.

In part because of its relevance to this particular case but also because I like to have a few things in the record for the future because this is something that is probably going to wind up becoming the subject of future cases and may eventually affect how the zoning regulations are rewritten.

This is a process that is going on right now, which is simply to say that I have some concern about the notion that the definition of what might be a food or grocery store, which is allowed in a C-1 zone. I know this is not a C-1 zone but that's the first zone in which this use is allowed, the idea that that definition might be broadened to include some other defined uses such as the

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

sale of prepared food.

2.1

There is a little bit of a concern that this might be a slippery slope in that in the future a grocery store might buy custom --wind up evolving into something that would include some other use, whether it's allowed in this zone or another zone, does actually have a significantly different potential impact and so, therefore, should be treated separately.

In this case because both uses are permitted in C-1, we technically can't define the sale of prepared food as an accessory use to the grocery use. It's almost as if the definition of grocery doesn't have to change.

As a result simply because it's not an accessory use and it's in the same class of use, it's more or less okay without special exception.

I think this is going to be an issue that will have to be addressed when we get the zoning regulations rewrite because

many of these uses are no longer going to be defined so specifically.

We are going from a very long list of definitions of uses to a much shorter list and then focusing on the potential impacts of any given use and address the more specific issues like is parking needed or is there likely to be a need for dealing with trash issues or things like that associated with a specific use.

All that having been said, I am comforted by the notion that this is not really a use variance because I think it's a hard sell. It's a use variance. If it were to be treated as a special exception, I think that would be okay but I think if a special exception is not necessary, if that is the consensus of the Board I think I would be comfortable with that.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you Mr. May. Again, sort of words to the wise regarding kind of what makes this very, very

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

unique to the extent that others would try to use this as a precedent in the future, the idea that both uses are permitted in the C-1 so technically the prepared foods add-on use, or whatever we want to call it, would not be accessory.

As you said, it would tend to come up again and the Zoning Commission is the place that would tend to amend the current text definitions and provide new ones so Mr.

May's thoughts on it take on added significance.

Why don't we turn to the Office of Planning just for a very brief sort of weighin and I think we will be ready to make a decision on it, if there be any. Good afternoon.

MR. MORDFIN: Good afternoon. I'm Stephen Mordfin with the Office of Planning.

In this case the Office of Planning did find that this case was very similar to 17906 although applied for under different sections

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

as directed by the Office of Zoning.

2.1

After reading through the transcript from that previous case 17906 we are in agreement that these two are very similar. They are in awkward districts. They want to add hot beverages and sandwiches, or hot dogs I think was in the other case, to a nonconforming grocery store in an R-4 District in a building that was built as a retail space. Taking direction then from the Board in that previous case we would agree this would be customarily accessory use.

However, if the Board did not see that in this case, then we do see that, one, if it were to be a special exception pursuant to Section 2003, that this also meets all the criteria from that section to make that case similar to the other.

Or if the Board found this should be a variance as directed by the Zoning

Administrator, then this case also meets all of those criteria for the granting of the use

variance in this case and would recommend approval of the application.

2.1

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you. I think that's pretty clear. It sounds like you tend to agree with where we are coming out, that this sort of stands on all fours with the Jong case from, I guess, maybe April of last year.

With that is there any further discussion that we need to have on this case? It doesn't sound like it. I would then move that we dismiss the case. I don't know if we need to move and vote on that. Okay, we do need to move. So then I would move that we dismiss this case with the understanding that the proposed added inventory is a normal customary part of the grocery business.

We're talking specifically about the hot beverages, danish, donuts, and the cold and hot panini sandwiches and leave to another day the discussion about what else might be on that slope or what might slip off

1	of that slope. The application presented to
2	us is those narrow things.
3	Is there a second?
4	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I second.
5	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Motion has been
6	made to dismiss and seconded. Is there
7	further discussion? Hearing none, all those
8	in favor say aye.
9	ALL: Aye.
10	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All those
11	well, there is no opposition I don't think.
12	Are there any abstentions?
13	Ms. Bailey, I'm sorry. If you
14	could read back
15	MS. BAILEY: Record the vote?
16	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Yes.
17	MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, the
18	vote is recorded as four zero one to dismiss
19	the application as stated by the Board. Mr.
20	Loud made the motion, Mrs. Moldenhauer
21	seconded, Ms. Sorg and Mr. May support the
22	motion

1	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Ms.
2	Bailey. I want to thank the applicant for
3	your package and also for what you're doing in
4	the community. We did see certainly
5	speaking for myself saw the before and after
6	pictures of the corner grocery store, saw the
7	interior shots of the baskets holding the
8	fruit and the presentation looking so so
9	wonderful. Again, keep up the good work in
10	that community.
11	As you add inventory you may want
12	to consult with appropriate expertise
13	regarding making sure that you are in
14	compliance with the grocery store use. Okay?
15	MS. SHEWANGEZAW: Thank you.
16	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All right. Is
17	there anything further in this case?
18	MS. BAILEY: Mrs. Nagelhout wants
19	me to mention that we are doing a dismissal
20	summary order, Mr. Chairman.
21	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you and
2.2	thank Mrs. Nagelhout for that. So we are

1	doing a dismissal summary order which means
2	you'll have it in a couple of days.
3	MS. SHEWANGEZAW: Thank you.
4	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you.
5	I think we have one final case
6	this afternoon. When you are ready, Ms.
7	Bailey, we can call that.
8	MS. BAILEY: I'm ready, Mr.
9	Chairman. It's Application 17975 of Cleotilde
10	E. Galvez Kimmell and it's pursuant to 11 DCMR
11	Section 3104.1 for a special exception for a
12	child development center. That's 12 children
13	and 4 teachers under Section 205. The
14	property is located at 6524 8th Street, N.W.
15	It is zoned R-1-B. It's also located in
16	Square 2973 on Lot 81.
17	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Ms.
18	Bailey. The parties are at the table with
19	counsel and with the language interpreter.
20	Good afternoon. I think, and correct me if
21	I'm wrong, Board Members, I think this is
22	going to be a really truncated hearing because

we heard this case before, pretty much all of this case before, and we were very supportive of granting the relief.

However, because of the need for a parking variance we requested that you renotice the case. It's my understanding that has been done so you are now back with the variance request. You briefed us on how the test is made. From my vantage point I guess I would just be looking to hear a quick walk-through of how the variance test is made and then we can move to review the request for relief.

Do Board Members see it any differently? Okay. Then we'll ask OP to weigh in as well on the variance but that's where we are. Just in terms of framing your presentation I think we're just looking to have you walk through that. I think you've got a supplemental report from the ANC.

MS. ZEGEYE: Yes. Thank you very much. We just want to start the conversation

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	by saying that in the previous application we
2	were talking about the use variance and we
3	amended that and we are asking for an area
4	variance which needs to satisfy a lesser
5	burden of practical difficulty. In talking
6	about the variance that is what we will be
7	discussing.
8	MS. SALA: Emily Sala.
9	MS. KIMMELL: Cleotilde Galvez
10	Kimmell.
11	MR. URIBE: Andrew Uribe,
12	interpreter.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman,
14	before we get started, I just wanted to
15	mention the fact that I was not here for the
16	original hearing on this case but I have
17	reviewed the record and read the transcript so
18	I'm prepared to participate in full.
19	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
20	May.
21	MEMBER SORG: Mr. Chairman, also I
22	should add the same thing, that I also was not

1	here during the original hearing and have read
2	the record and should be able to participate
3	fully.
4	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Ms.
5	Sorg as well. Thank you both.
6	MS. ZEGEYE: The first test for a
7	practical difficulty for an area variance is
8	to show that there is some uniqueness or
9	special situation in regards to Ms. Kimmell's
10	property.
11	Actually, before proceeding we
12	also would like to state for the record that
13	after consideration of both what the Office of
14	Planning as stated in their application and
15	looking at Ms. Kimmell's property we have a
16	different opinion as to whether or not a
17	parking space can be constructed on her
18	property. We actually don't think that is
19	possible
20	MS. SALA: Going back to the first
21	factor to look at being uniqueness, Ms.
22	Kimmell's property is on a corner of 8th and

1	Van Buren, N.W. The entrance to her home, her
2	front door, is on 8th Street. She also has a
3	driveway going into her garage parallel.
4	Coming off of 8th Street there is a public
5	alley that abuts part of her yard.
6	MS. ZEGEYE: We know it's kind of
7	hard to visualize all that so we tried to draw
8	approximately what we're talking about so if
9	the Board is willing to look at that drawing,
10	we are willing to provide it to the Board.
11	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Are you saying
12	you brought a drawing? You only have one copy
13	of it?
14	MS. ZEGEYE: Yes, we do, but I
15	think we have looked at it enough.
16	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I guess it
17	would be helpful. It will be hard for each of
18	us to look at it as you're talking so perhaps
19	what we can do
20	MR. MOY: If you would like, Mr.
21	Chairman, staff can make copies of that.
22	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. If you

1 would like, perhaps give it to Ms. Bailey or 2 Mr. Moy. They will make copies. Are you able 3 to walk through some of your presentation 4 without that or do we need to take a bit of a 5 break? 6 MS. ZEGEYE: Yes. 7 CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. 8 MS. ZEGEYE: In addition being 9 that it's a corner lot there is a building 10 restriction line both on part of the property 15 feet coming in off of Van Buren and 15 feet 11 12 coming off of 8th Street. It is unique for 13 the building restriction line to be on both 14 ends of that corner property. 15 MS. SALA: Also her house is 16 pretty massive in comparison to the rest of the houses in the neighborhood and occupies 17 about what we think is 67 percent of the 18 19 property which leaves her with very little 20 space to work with when we take into

NEAL R. GROSS

consideration also the existence of this

building restriction line.

2.1

1	MS. ZEGEYE: In addition to that
2	Ms. Kimmell has also three trees on her
3	property, one on the Van Buren side and two on
4	the yard abutting the alley. Any construction
5	would require to remove those trees which is
6	also an added uniqueness to her property just
7	because the other properties around the
8	neighborhood do not have that many trees or
9	trees that are that old or demonstrate that
10	kind of characteristics.
11	MS. SALA: It's important to note
12	those trees are close to the right up next
13	to the electrical poles, power lines, thereby
14	complicating their placement.
15	MS. ZEGEYE: As Emily said, it is
16	a fact that the driveway is a sloping driveway
17	indicating there is some unevenness on the
18	property that need to be taken into account
19	and researched before any kind of construction
20	on the yard will take place.
21	MS. SALA: The yard abutting the

alley is also surrounded by a fence and this

1	has to be removed if there is any
2	construction.
3	MS. ZEGEYE: Although it's not
4	related to the actual property the fact that
5	the teachers that Ms. Kimmell will employ
6	reside with her we think present a unique
7	situation in this case. There is no problem
8	of access to the development center because
9	they all live there so they don't require any
10	kind of additional parking that may be the
11	case in development centers where people don't
12	live there and teach there.
13	MS. SALA: We believe that the
14	Office of Planning's report suggesting that
15	there could be a parking space constructed on
16	one of the yards was referring to the yard
17	abutting the alley and it would be practically
18	difficult and cost-wise practically impossible
19	to accomplish this.
20	MS. ZEGEYE: So just to, I guess,
21	walk through that discussion on page 4 of the

application that we have submitted, we tried

and see really what would be needed in terms of measurement if she was to construct this parking space and taking into account again the building restriction line, the space that she has available for her is about, again, approximately 500 square feet.

If we go with the premise that at the minimum you need a 9 by 19 for a parking space as per the regulation she would need to provide about 171 square feet just for that parking space without talking about the access and all the other construction and spaces that she has to make available to make that parking space useable.

As you can see in that paragraph we think that she would need 456 square feet to do this parking space and she only have 500. If the parking space is constructed perpendicularly to the public alley, it would just go straight basically up to her house. If it is constructed parallel to the public

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	alley, it would just basically kissing the
2	fence that is separating her house from that
3	of the neighbor.
4	In both cases it's really
5	difficult to construct that. That is without
6	even adding the reduction in property value to
7	have such an awkwardly positioned parking
8	space when there is a driveway to another
9	parking space that is completely separate from
10	this one.
11	MS. SALA: So in summary partially
12	I want to emphasize again there would be
13	safety issues if there was any construction in
14	that area and it would go over the building
15	restriction line.
16	In addition, as we noted, the
17	trees would have to be removed. We want to
18	note that it is the BZ Office of Planning
19	policy in its comprehensive plan to preserve
20	residential yards and to discourage putting in

permeable surfaces over those yards.

This would be going up against

21

that policy and it's definitely not something that people should be asked to do, to remove trees from their yard not only because it's costly but because those trees are right by the power lines, right by the alley, right by the other neighbors houses. That can be dangerous, too, but because you should have a sense of some kind of yard, a green space that is your own. That is part of the D.C. policy.

MS. ZEGEYE: Especially given Ms.

Kimmell's case again who does not employ
anybody from outside the house a strict
compliance with the zoning regulations creates
serious practical difficulty and would be
economically prohibited to her to construct an
additional parking space.

In addition to the cost of removing that we looked at the permit fees and the construction cost looking at the market rate, the going market rate for the D.C. area. We came up with a large sum of money that she would have to invest in order to satisfy this

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1 requirement and that is going to be cost 2 prohibitive and practically difficult for her. 3 MS. SALA: So the fees. There is 4 kind of a long list of fees, construction 5 cost, lawyer cost. Again, that would include 6 the cost of removing trees which can probably 7 start around \$500 for each of those two trees, probably more due to their location near other 8 9 houses, near power lines and near a public 10 alley, as well as the fact they are pretty tall. In addition there is the time and 11 12 inconvenience cost this could present to her 13 neighbors and should be considered. 14 MS. ZEGEYE: Aside from looking at 15 her actual property we also based on previous 16 transcript from the Board we looked at 17 mitigating circumstances, things that she 18 could do to ensure that the granting of this 19 variance would not create any kind of problem. 20 We contacted several businesses in 2.1 the neighborhood as well as community members.

At the time of the submission of the amended

1 application we hadn't received any response 2 from these entities that we had contacted. 3 However, in the last week we 4 received three positive responses, namely from 5 one church and two neighbors who are willing 6 to provide Ms. Kimmell a parking space for her 7 day care if needed. The support from the 8 church is from the Baptist Church on 401 Van 9 Buren, I think, next to the Takoma Recreation 10 Center and they wrote a letter, which we have. 11 Again, I don't know whether we'll 12 be able to submit that to the Board but they 13 basically said that they would be willing to 14 offer her the parking space that they use. 15 Again, that parking space is on-street parking 16 space but we think that at the least it serves 17 to show that the community is definitely 18 behind Ms. Kimmell and supports her fully in 19 her endeavor. 20 MS. SALA: Ms. Kimmell also spoke 2.1 from and has a signed letter as well as

pictures of two very, very close-by neighbor's

1	homes. They have offered her space in their
2	driveway. They have two two-car garages and
3	they have only one car and they want to
4	support by offering her their off-street
5	parking. We have letters and pictures of
6	those as well to submit if we are allowed to
7	do that.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Do you have
9	those with you?
10	MS. SALA: Um-hum.
11	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I guess you can
12	submit it but it's my understanding to locate
13	a required space off site would take a
14	different kind of relief. It would take
15	special exception relief. Are you asking for
16	that now or are you asking for the variance
17	from the requirement in the first place?
18	MS. ZEGEYE: We are asking for the
19	variance from the requirement. We're talking
20	about these three letters just to show that
21	there are mitigating circumstances. In the

event that there is a car that needs to be

1	parked in relation to Ms. Kimmell's child
2	development center there are at least three
3	areas that are readily available for that to
4	happen. It's just in addition to the variance
5	argument.
6	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Why don't you
7	go ahead and submit it and we can ourselves,
8	I guess, try to sort out what we might do.
9	MS. ZEGEYE: Okay. Just to
10	continue, in addition to that Ms. Kimmell's
11	property is located very close to Metro
12	stations and public buses. She's 10 minutes
13	from Takoma Metro Station so teachers if
14	needed can park there and just walk 10 minutes
15	to the child development center or they can
16	just take the many, many buses that drive and
17	stop right on Georgia Avenue very close by to
18	her house.
19	The fact that she's so well-
20	endowed in terms of like public transportation
21	access will mitigate the need to provide a

parking space, off-street parking space for

1	her teachers. And there are also parking
2	garages that are available that people can
3	park there.
4	We talked to Ms. Kimmell and she
5	is even willing to consider to make it a
6	requirement of employment. Again, as it
7	currently stands all the four teachers that
8	she is employing live with her. They are her
9	family members.
10	In the event that she needs to
11	hire somebody from outside, she can make it a
12	requirement to use some type of public
13	transportation. The need for the off-street
14	parking requirement does not arise.
15	MS. SALA: Again, we would like to
16	note as part of the variance requested this is
17	in line with the zone plan. We believe it is
18	also in the public interest of her family and
19	her neighbors. It's a request that makes
20	sense for the situation.
21	We are in agreement with the
22	Office of Planning report that this should be

1	reevaluated in five years and that would be
2	another opportunity to address these same
3	issues if there is any issue continuing into
4	the future.
5	MS. ZEGEYE: And just, I guess, a
6	final point is that we were able to get the
7	minutes from the ANC and we hope that in
8	addition to the letter that was submitted
9	previously these minutes can give the
10	necessary information in terms of quorum to
11	allow the Board to consider the ANC letter and
12	give it the great weight that it usually gets.
13	Thank you.
14	MS. SALA: Thank you.
15	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you. We
16	appreciate that presentation. Let me see if
17	Board Members have any questions in follow-up
18	to the presentation.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Looking at the
20	plan that you just provided, which I have now
21	buried somewhere in here. I just wanted to

double check something. There is a dimension

1	in here that seems to indicate that the
2	distance from the back wall of the house to
3	the fence at the alley is 20 feet. Is that
4	correct? Looking at this photograph it kind
5	of looks like it's a little bit more than
6	that.
7	MS. ZEGEYE: From the back
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Of the house.
9	MS. ZEGEYE: of the house. Oh,
10	that would be the front, right? On the map is
11	that the front that you're looking at?
12	MS. SALA: The yard along the
13	alley.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: The yard along
15	the alley.
16	MS. ZEGEYE: It's about 15 to 20
17	feet.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: From the back
19	of the house to the alley?
20	MS. ZEGEYE: Let me make sure.
21	Are you talking about this one?
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: No.

1	MS. ZEGEYE: You're talking about
2	this right here?
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: The distance
4	from the house itself. There you go, from
5	that line to that line.
6	MS. ZEGEYE: Yes. It's about 20.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Twenty feet.
8	Okay. Photos can be sort of deceptive because
9	this looks like it's a little bit longer than
10	that. Can you tell me if there is a
11	difference in the elevation, the height of the
12	yard versus the alley? Is the yard higher
13	than the alley or is it at the same level?
14	MS. SALA: I believe it's a little
15	bit higher.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: Any idea how
17	much higher?
18	MS. ZEGEYE: About two feet maybe.
19	There is some elevation. Again, you can also
20	look at the plat that was given by the
21	surveyor in terms of like the calculation, the
22	plat from the surveyor and the 20 feet that

1	we've added there I think should correspond.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: The plat from
3	the surveyor really only shows the dimensions
4	of the property itself and then the building
5	restriction line. It doesn't show anything
6	about elevations or heights of things.
7	MS. ZEGEYE: It doesn't show
8	anything about the elevation.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: It doesn't show
10	anything about the distance to the house.
11	MS. SALA: I could submit one
12	photo that will show you at least the yard
13	itself is elevated significantly above the
14	sidewalk.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. That
16	would be very helpful because, frankly, I'm
17	not convinced on the difficulty of creating a
18	parking space here because it's relatively
19	speaking flat and square and there is rear
20	yard space to work with. The next question I
21	have is the rear yard has some play equipment

in it.

1	MS. ZEGEYE: Could you repeat
2	that, sir?
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: The rear yard
4	has some play equipment in it.
5	MS. ZEGEYE: Yes.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: But I see
7	looking at the Office of Planning's report
8	that the outdoor play area would be the Takoma
9	Rec Center, not the rear yard, that it would
10	not be on site, that it would only be down at
11	the rec center.
12	MS. ZEGEYE: Yes, she currently
13	uses the rec center.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: So the rear
15	yard is not used at all for recreation,
16	outdoor play?
17	MS. SALA: It's not. Ms. Kimmell
18	also has two grandchildren and some of those
19	toys are family toys, that kind of thing.
20	It's not used for her day care service.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
22	MS. ZEGEYE: I just want to repeat

again that this is a home business and it's not just a center. It's also a place where she resides.

that. I'm just checking to get clarification about this. If it were actually used and was part of the recreation area, you could make the argument, I think, that the parking space would eat up too much of the rear yard and so you could have the outdoor play area but if you're not arguing that you need that outdoor play area, then you can't use that argument. I'm trying to find areas to help make the case because what I've heard so far hasn't really made the case for me.

Looking at this photograph it looks like it's a foot to a foot-and-a-half of greater elevation on the backyard. Now --

MS. ZEGEYE: Are there any specific questions that you have in terms of the argument that we made? There is only 500 square feet left for her to work with if you

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	take into consideration the building
2	restriction line.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. Well,
4	that is a good question. The building
5	restriction line restricts you from having a
6	building but it doesn't necessarily restrict
7	you from having a parking space.
8	MS. ZEGEYE: That is actually up
9	for discussion because we looked at the regs
10	and there is no limitation as to what a
11	building restriction line means. I could
12	easily mean both building restriction and just
13	construction generally speaking.
14	MS. SALA: Looking at past cases
15	from the BZA in terms of the transcripts I
16	found several transcripts but I didn't find
17	anything that conflicted with the idea that
18	the building restriction line provided a line
19	past which construction couldn't take place
20	and that included parking on those transcripts
21	that I cited.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't claim

1	to have done any case research on this but
2	just reading the zoning regulations with
3	regard to a building line, and this is in
4	Chapter 1, it refers I won't read the whole
5	thing but the definition is for building line.
6	It's actually "line, building."
7	It says, "It also applies to
8	building restriction lines but it is a line
9	beyond which property owners have no legal or
10	vested right to extend a building or any part
11	of a building without special permission and
12	approval of proper authorities."
13	Building and part of the building
14	is the only thing that is restricted there.
15	It doesn't say anything about a parking space.
16	In fact, you can put fences and things like
17	that very obviously because you have a fence
18	there.
19	MS. ZEGEYE: Yes, that's true.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't think
21	there is a restriction that says you can't
	1

have a parking space in that area. I'm not

1	advocating that we are going to require
2	putting a parking space in what is effectively
3	the front lawn or the side lawn of this house.
4	In that rear area I think you have more space
5	to work with.
6	I would also question the argument
7	that you actually need something like 450
8	square feet for that. A 9 by 19 space can be
9	directly abutting the alley and so there it
10	only requires 171 square feet according to
11	your calculation.
12	MS. ZEGEYE: Yes. It would
13	require also the removal of the two trees
14	because
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: I understand
16	that. I wasn't talking about the trees. I
17	was just talking about the argument about 456
18	square feet.
19	MS. ZEGEYE: We would like to
20	actually refer you to page 3 of the amended
21	application that we submitted in the footnote.
22	I think it's footnote 4 where we list all the

precedent that the Board of Zoning actually looked at building restriction in relation to parking spaces and that they've talked about it in a way that would led someone to infer that building restriction lines are also looked at just construction, not just lines of the building.

COMMISSIONER MAY: It would be different if we were talking about the right-of-way because you couldn't put a parking space into what would be right-of-way space but if you're talking about a building restriction line, I'm fairly certain that you can put a parking space there.

Again, just back to the basic square footage requirement, there isn't really -- I mean, you don't 450 square feet. You only need a little under 200 square feet. You would have to take out a tree but I don't know that we're going to treat a tree in a protection area here or anything else like that that would apply where zoning would

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	actually apply. It may contribute to the
2	unique circumstance.
3	I would allow that that either
4	there are not a lot of trees around or this is
5	a very significant feature of the property or
6	something like that. That might get somewhere
7	but I'm not sold on that yet. Anyway,k those
8	were the specific questions that I had.
9	MS. ZEGEYE: In terms of the
10	measurement of the parking we looked at what
11	was required for commercial parking and that
12	is how we inferred to get to the 456. Again,
13	the way we are looking at it is, okay, the
14	parking space is 171 square feet but you
15	probably need to make some space around it for
16	people to enter in and then park the car.
17	You just can't come right from the
18	alley and back out. We thought that just
19	doing it like that would actually raise some

COMMISSIONER MAY: It's a little

safety issues for people going up and down the

NEAL R. GROSS

alley.

20

21

1	tight with a 15-foot alley to make a 90-degree
2	turn into a parking space but it's not
3	impossible and it would mean widening it maybe
4	a little bit. You'd have to go to 10 or 11
5	feet instead of nine feet in order to make
6	that turn. It wouldn't require 450 feet.
7	MS. ZEGEYE: Okay.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.
9	May. Additional questions?
10	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I just think
11	Mr. May's question was very pointed about the
12	potential applicant using the rear yard ever
13	for the children and I wasn't sure if maybe
14	you wanted to ask the applicant that question
15	or if you guys have already had that
16	discussion with the applicant.
17	MS. ZEGEYE: Well, like Emily
18	said, the applicant used that yard for her
19	grandchildren.
20	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Do we know if
21	she has ever used it for her students? Do the
22	children ever go outside and just enjoy a

1	breath of fresh air during the day?
2	MS. SALA: The monitors of the
3	Office of the State Superintendent of
4	Education have indicated to Ms. Kimmell that
5	if she were to use it for her business it
6	would have to go through some additional
7	modifications to make it a safer play area.
8	She would have to do something.
9	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: So you're
10	saying that OSSE does not permit her to use
11	that in conjunction with her business?
12	MS. SALA: As it currently stands.
13	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: As it
14	currently exist.
15	MS. SALA: However, again, this
16	case is going to come back. The Office of
17	Planning has suggested a five-year review and,
18	you know, perhaps after that she may want to
19	utilize that.
20	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: These cases a
21	lot of them have conditions time-wise but
22	we're trying to figure out in regards to this

1	current case and the ability to place parking
2	in the rear of the property which I think Mr.
3	May has gone through in detail that it
4	potentially is possible and I was just trying
5	to get some more additional detail on that one
6	issue.
7	The back porch, do you know how
8	large that is? You have it in your diagram
9	and I'm assuming that your diagram is probably
10	not just scale in aspects.
11	MS. ZEGEYE: We have other picture
12	to show because I think it's better than just
13	trying to give you an approximate measurement
14	of that. It comes up
15	MS. SALA: With the pictures we
16	submitted with the amended statement you may
17	see it. Again, it's a question of the angle
18	of the picture but there is another picture to
19	submit.
20	Addressing the issue of whether
21	this could ever be used as a play area, Ms.
22	Kimmell has told us she is not opposed to that

1	at all. She's interested in it. It's just
2	something that would be a cost that she hasn't
3	put forward yet and, frankly, she wanted to
4	present a strong application for her special
5	exception as well.
6	She wanted to have every point on
7	her side and if her neighbors were even
8	potentially going to argue that this could
9	create noise, she wasn't going to step forward
10	with it but it's her yard. I think she should
11	have it and she has expressed interest in
12	using it in the future. It's not something
13	that she should be deprived of.
14	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Okay. You're
15	making an argument to incur the cost of trying
16	to renovate this to put parking in the rear
17	would then potentially be a detriment because
18	in the future she may want to actually improve
19	it so that she could use it in conjunction
20	with her child development center?

MS. ZEGEYE: Yes.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER:

Thank you.

21

1 COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, 2 if I could insert one thing. I have 3 effectively been corrected by the Office of 4 the Attorney General that the required parking space can't be located between the building 5 6 line and the lot line so it can't go in that 7 space that is on the side of the property but 8 it can still go in the rear yard and that 9 would require taking the tree. 10 However, I still haven't quite 11

However, I still haven't quite cleared that hurdle. I mean, you made the argument that Ms. Kimmell should not be deprived of her yard but she's trying to do something that carries certain requirements with it, one of those being a parking space. If you want to have the day care center, you might need to put the parking space in.

MS. ZEGEYE: And we also would like to, I guess, add that one of the arguments that we had and that Ms. Kimmell in trying to prove an area variance is needed to show practical difficulty and having to remove

NEAL R. GROSS

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	trees and do all this. It may seem not to be
2	a lot but for her it's a lot of construction
3	and cost is a practical difficulty for her.
4	Given her economic situation that is cost
5	prohibitive.
6	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Are there any
7	further Board questions? Did counsel have
8	anything further?
9	MS. ZEGEYE: No.
10	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Just a
11	couple of quick questions on these offers to
12	provide parking from neighbors. Are these
13	adjacent neighbors, 6528 and 6512 8th Street?
14	MS. SALA: I think the applicant
15	can speak to that, the closeness of the home,
16	the two neighbors.
17	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Just tell me
18	your address again and I can figure it out.
19	MS. ZEGEYE: They are like a
20	couple of blocks I think I mean, a couple
21	of houses.
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: If 6524 is the

1	address of the applicant and we have 6520,
2	which would be the same side of the street,
3	and it may be next door.
4	MS. KIMMELL: The one neighbor is
5	the house next to my house and the other one
6	is three houses after my house.
7	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Thank
8	you.
9	MS. KIMMELL: Thank you.
10	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Now let's turn
11	to the Office of Planning for your report.
12	MR. MORDFIN: Good afternoon. I'm
13	Stephen Mordfin with the Office of Planning.
14	We reviewed the criteria for the granting of
15	the special exception. I don't remember if we
16	did this at the last hearing.
17	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: You know, I
18	thought we did. If you want to go through it,
19	you can.
20	MR. MORDFIN: I thought we did,
21	too. What I would like to do, though, because
22	I thought that this was done before, is just

1	go over the additional information that was
2	presented regarding the parking.
3	First I would like to clarify that
4	with the pervious surface the zoning
5	regulations under 2117.10 dos allow for
6	pervious, not impervious on private property.
7	If the applicant were required to put in a
8	parking space, it could be pervious within the
9	rear yard.
10	Now, I do see that we have the
11	drawing that was submitted by the applicant
12	but because everything is approximate and not
13	done to scale, it's kind of difficult to
14	determine whether or not you could actually
15	put a parking space in there.
16	We don't know the exact locations
17	of the trees. I suspect that there probably
18	is 19 feet there from other drawings that were
19	submitted between the rear of the alley and
20	the rear of the house.
21	Also, with regard to the 450
22	square feet that you would need for parking,

I think that mostly relates to when you are constructing a parking lot as opposed to putting in a driveway.

that you could park a car in so I think the 171 square feet would be all that would be necessary if the applicant were required to put in a parking space to just pave that much and it could be done with pervious paving to reduce the impact on the rear yard and reduce the impact on those trees in the rear yard so that you are not paving over the dripline of those trees.

I think there is a unique situation there. I think it's still within the application that all of the applicants for the child development center would also be the residents and the employees would both be living in the house. They would be living in the house and working in the house so you wouldn't have the impact of them driving to the site.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	The applicant has submitted some
2	neighbors who are willing. They are across
3	the alley. I think that it would probably
4	meet the test for a special exception to
5	locate the parking spaces off site because it
6	would just be across an alley. I'm not sure
7	which ones are which.
8	I think each one of those would
9	need to provide two parking spaces because
10	they wouldn't be able to give us the one
11	parking space required for them if they are
12	required one parking space for their
13	residences.
14	If they have it now they have to
15	have the one so it would only be if you had
16	two parking spaces would you be able to give
17	us one of them for use by the applicant of the
18	child development center.
19	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Just on that
20	note, have you actually seen the pictures that
21	they submitted?

MR. MORDFIN: I've seen --

1	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: It looks to me
2	like it's two but maybe we should clarify.
3	MR. MORDFIN: Are they both two
4	parking spaces?
5	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Well, the one
6	exhibit I'm looking at is 6520 which I guess
7	would be directly next door, they show a
8	picture of two garage doors. I don't know if
9	that's sort of a row garage. As a matter of
10	fact, we can establish that on the record
11	today.
12	MR. MORDFIN: No, I didn't see
13	that one with the two parking spaces. In that
14	case, one would be available. If those two
15	parking spaces go to one residence, one would
16	be available for the applicant to use.
17	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I'm looking at
18	the second one and it looks like it shows
19	a picture of one vehicle already parked there
20	so it looks adequate enough for two vehicles.
21	Would you agree?

MR. MORDFIN: I agree with that.

1 I didn't see that and I do agree that does 2 look adequate. 3 Those were my comments on whether 4 or not if the Board determines that a parking 5 space should be provided that it looks like 6 they would meet the criteria for a special 7 exception to locate it off site. It's within 8 the square. It's across the alley. 9 It's convenient to the site. I'm 10 not sure whether or not you could put one onto 11 the property or not because I don't think that 12 we have drawings adequately drawn to scale 13 that could determine whether or not it could 14 be placed there or not so I can't really 15 comment on that. 16 CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you. The 17 bottom line opinion of OP on the variance is 18 that the practical difficulty is not met? 19 MR. MORDFIN: We thought the practical difficulty was met. We thought it 20 2.1 was an unusual situation where you have the

NEAL R. GROSS

same people who work there also live there.

1	(Whereupon, there was a test of
2	the fire alarm system.)
3	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I guess we're
4	okay.
5	MR. MORDFIN: So we thought that
6	was an unusual situation for this application
7	that you would have the same people that would
8	be both living there and working there. We
9	thought that was unusual and that led to a
10	practical difficulty.
11	If there is already one parking
12	space provided for this residence as required,
13	under the zoning regulations they have to
14	provide a second one that would be used by the
15	same people predominately and we thought was
16	a practical difficulty.
17	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All right.
18	Let's see if there are any questions from
19	Board Members for OP
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: With regard to
21	the unusual circumstance of the workers
22	actually being residence in the house, I mean,

1	that is not something that can be guaranteed
2	through the life of this variance I would
3	think. It's like saying the workers work down
4	the street. Well, yeah, they do now but we
5	couldn't write an order that would specify
6	that the workers must live in the house so how
7	do we take comfort in that thought?
8	MR. MORDFIN: I do agree with you
9	that there is no guarantee that in the future
10	the same people that work for this child
11	development center today would be working
12	there tomorrow.
13	That is something to take into
14	consideration that that could change in which
15	case the additional parking space perhaps
16	would need to be leased or whatever
17	arrangements they would make from the
18	neighbors to have that one additional parking
19	space as is required for the day care center,
20	or child development center rather.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Let me just ask

a couple of quick follow-up questions as regards, I guess, the proffer of these offsite spaces just in case we get into that whole issue. Do you think that the current rear yard has unusual topography, grade, shape, size, or dimensions that contribute to perhaps it not being the most convenient place in terms of efficiency of design, etc., to locate rear parking?

MR. MORDFIN: I don't think I have enough information to determine that you couldn't put one there. It is a rectangular lot. I think it's a relatively level lot. I know there are two trees back there. What I don't know is the distance from the rear of the house or from the stairs and the porch to the lot line, or rather to the alley line, to know whether or not you could put a 19-foot deep parking space in there.

I don't know the exact locations of the trees to know whether or not you could actually put a nine-foot space in there.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	Although from the photos it looks like you
2	probably could, I don't think it's
3	sufficiently documented on the drawing that
4	was handed out today to know whether or not
5	you could put one parking space there.
6	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
7	Alternatively do you think a determination
8	could be made that locating the parking space
9	in the rear would not be practical because of
10	the lack of appropriate ingress or egress
11	through the existing proposed alley?
12	MR. MORDFIN: The existing alley
13	system, it's 15-feet wide and from other
14	drawings that I have you see there are other
15	people that have garages on those alleys and
16	they are using those garages for parking so I
17	don't know why this one would be different if
18	other houses down adjoining would be able to
19	pull in and out of their garages.
20	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: That's a good
21	point.
	II

1	practical to locate the spaces on site if the
2	location on another lot would result in a more
3	efficient use of land, better design, or safer
4	perhaps ingress or egress and less adverse
5	affect? Would that criteria be met for this
6	case?
7	MR. MORDFIN: It perhaps would be
8	safer to locate it some place else rather than
9	on this lot just because it is on the corner
10	near 8th Street so probably you would want to
11	locate your driveway further to the west so
12	that you don't back out into Van Buren Street
13	when you are pulling out.
14	There may be a tree there but I
15	don't know the exact location of that tree.
16	Maybe DDOT would want to comment on the
17	location of where it would locate the driver
18	and whether or not it would be safe to pull in
19	and out of that location.
20	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Thank
21	you. I don't have any additional questions.

NEAL R. GROSS

Board Members, do you have any

1	follow-up? Okay.
2	Does the applicant have any
3	questions for the Office of Planning?
4	MS. ZEGEYE: No. Just a comment
5	basically in terms of the discussion about the
6	fact that the workers live there. We want to
7	reiterate the fact that this is a home
8	business. Ms. Kimmell moved in there in 2006
9	with the intention of having a business where
10	her entire family could be engaged in and so
11	long as Ms. Kimmell and her family live in
12	there, that is going to be the case.
13	Yes, there is no guarantee as to
14	whether or not in the future that situation
15	will change but we will also like to note that
16	this case has a five year review so within
17	five years she comes back and it's evident
18	that it's the same people, that will answer
19	any kind of questions that you may have as to
20	the workers living there.
21	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. SALA: I would ask you to

consider the cost to her and her family when
this spot would be available for the same
people who already have a parking spot and
when there is available parking in the area
including off-street parking. I would just
ask you to consider what makes sense.

MS. ZEGEYE: Finally, just the burden is practical difficulty. I think the applicant has shown that it is practically difficult for her to adhere to this requirement and this requirement can be weighed without significant impact to the zoning regulation and to the public. As a matter of fact, she's serving the public.

She's offering very low-cost day care where nearby development centers do not accept government vouchers anymore. She is one actually around her neighborhood that accept government vouchers and provide this kind of service for people who are not able to get that elsewhere.

MS. SALA: Part of the reason she

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	can't afford
2	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Timeout.
3	Timeout. You are going to get a chance to
4	have a closing statement and you can
5	incorporate a lot of the remarks. I had
6	allowed a number of the follow-up remarks but
7	this is really the point and I think this is
8	important to you as law students.
9	This is the point where you ask
10	questions of the Office of Planning based on
11	its report. If they are not necessarily
12	specific questions for them but more comments
13	along the lines of what you had shared with
14	us, you can wrap those into your closing
15	statement.
16	MS. ZEGEYE: I just have one
17	question.
18	Mr. Mordfin, you specified that
19	when you made that statement as to the
20	possibility of her building the parking space

NEAL R. GROSS

you were just looking at, I guess, aerial view

of the area and the building plat that was

21

1 given to the surveyor which doesn't give you 2 enough information as it is as to whether or 3 not that is a feasible thing. 4 You were not looking at the trees, 5 the fact that she has a porch with stairs that 6 come out and all those things. I'm asking you 7 given the fact that it seems as though that was a passing suggestion, can you truly state 8 9 it is feasible given the additional 10 information that was provided today? 11 MR. MORDFIN: I can't say 12 definitely that it's feasible to actually put 13 in a parking space but, at the same time, the 14 drawing that you submitted I also can't say 15 that it's not feasible. I don't have enough information to make a determination as to 16 17 whether you could or could not actually put in 18 one parking space. 19 MS. SALA: What information do you 20 feel you are lacking? There was an 2.1 acknowledgement of the slope or there being a

NEAL R. GROSS

different height also of --

1	MR. MORDFIN: I'm aware of the
2	slope. From looking at the drawings it
3	doesn't look like it's a steep slope. Also,
4	I don't have anything drawn to scale that
5	actually shows the location of where the
6	stairs, the porch, the two trees, and the
7	distance between the rear yard to say whether
8	or not yes, you could not put a parking space
9	in or maybe you could.
10	I don't have topography on this
11	either to show that it really does slope
12	downward a lot. The photographs don't look
13	like it really slopes all that much so I don't
14	have enough information to actually make that
15	determination.
16	MS. ZEGEYE: So basically your
17	standing is that you are not suggesting that
18	she can build a parking spot and you're not
19	suggesting that she cannot so, therefore,
20	there really are no suggestions.
21	MR. MORDFIN: Correct. I can't

say whether it can happen or it can't because

1	without the additional information I don't
2	feel comfortable making a determination one
3	way or the other.
4	MS. ZEGEYE: Therefore, we
5	could
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Can I interrupt
7	for just a second? I think you need to
8	understand that the burden is on you to prove
9	that you cannot build a parking space there.
10	The fact that he can't prove it one way or
11	another it doesn't help us reach a decision.
12	Really the burden is on you to demonstrate
13	that it is impossible to put a parking space
14	there or extremely
15	MS. ZEGEYE: It's practically
16	difficult.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well,
18	practically difficult is more than just it
19	would be inconvenient. You haven't done much
20	more if you could say that the distance
21	between the stairway and the alley was 16

NEAL R. GROSS

feet, that pretty much seals the case.

1	MS. ZEGEYE: We just want
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: We don't have
3	enough information to be able to determine
4	that yet.
5	MS. ZEGEYE: We just wanted to see
6	where the Office of Planning was coming from.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. I think
8	they told you that.
9	MS. ZEGEYE: We just wanted to
10	understand their position.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: I understand
12	but you are kind of pushing them too hard in
13	an area where it's not really their case to
14	make. It's your case to make.
15	MS. ZEGEYE: Thank you.
16	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you. Any
17	additional questions from the Board for either
18	Planning or the applicant? Okay. Very well.
19	I think Mr. May's direction regarding burdens
20	is something to really take to heart in this
21	type of case. The burden is the applicant's.
22	Yes.

1	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Sorry. One
2	point of clarification I wanted to ask
3	Planning.
4	What specifically do you find to
5	be unique about the properties? Is the major
6	point of uniqueness that you are focusing on
7	the fact that the staff members for the child
8	development center live on site or are you
9	looking at other factors, the fact that it's
10	a corner lot? I want to make sure when I'm
11	referring this that I understand exactly what
12	you see as unique.
13	MR. MORDFIN: You are correct that
14	we were focusing on that the same people that
15	worked at the child development center would
16	also be residing there. As for the uniqueness
17	as it relates directly to the property, that
18	doesn't really relate directly to the
19	property. It relates to the operation of the
20	property.
21	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: A point of
22	clarification. Our obligation is to find a

1	uniqueness as it relates to the property.
2	These type of relief are given to the property
3	and they run with the land. They don't go to
4	an individual so the reason is just an
5	individual's reason and not the actual
6	property, the topography being unique, the
7	size being unique, certain aspects of the
8	property.
9	We do sometimes allow a confluence
10	of factors for that but I think that to me is
11	a very weak element to kind of then get pass
12	that one point to then go to the other
13	elements, if the major issue would be the fact
14	that the individuals reside at the property
15	and not topography.
16	I think the issue is you don't
17	really do you know the topography? I think
18	that is one of the elements that we're
19	lacking. We don't actually have specific
20	topography or additional information in the

MR. MORDFIN: I've not seen any

NEAL R. GROSS

record.

1	topo on this site.
2	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Okay. I
3	think that is one of the elements that the
4	applicant's attorneys have been referencing
5	but we don't have specific documentation to
6	prove or to point to that as a unique aspect.
7	Thank you.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you,
9	Board Member Moldenhauer.
10	If there are no additional
11	questions this is the point in the proceeding
12	we would turn to the ANC. I don't believe
13	they are here for their report. I believe the
14	ANC did meet on this and they did submit
15	something.
16	I think the most understanding I
17	have is what they submitted initially didn't
18	meet all of our requirements for great weight.
19	A request was made of them to resubmit it and
20	I'm not sure if we did receive a resubmitted
21	ANC report.

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, as far

as I know there isn't a full report. We do have documentation concerning when they met and so forth.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Then in the absence of a full report we'll just note that we have the documentation regarding when they met and the actions they take but we will not give that great weight.

Now if there -- yes, I saw that email. If there are parties or persons in
support, parties or persons in opposition and
they are in the audience, this would be the
time to come up and give our three minutes of
testimony. I don't see anyone coming up so we
would turn now back to the applicant for any
closing remarks. Following that we'll make
some decisions here regarding next steps.

Before you do that, it might be good for you to address -- thank you, Ms.

Monroe -- the question of the ownership of the property. The property is listed as 6524 8th Street, N.W.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1 In one of the submissions from the 2 applicant, Exhibit 41, had an e-mail 3 attachment on it, a website download, that indicated the owner as a John O. Coleman. 4 5 order to be before us with an application we 6 would need the owner or, I think, absent the 7 owner some authorized consent from the owner so perhaps that issue could be addressed. 8 9 This gentleman was MS. KIMMELL: 10 the person who sold the house to my husband, Mr. Coleman. 11 12 CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. 13 Member Moldenhauer is indicating it looks like 14 it's an old copy of a download tax record. 15 don't see a date on it. 16 MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I would say 17 just for the record that this is a City Atlas 18 report that is provided by the D.C. Government 19 and sometimes these may be out of date. 20 usually pull their information from the online

recorder of deeds or from OTR and maybe there

was a problem with that.

2.1

1	Again, if you are putting
2	something in the record, take a look at the
3	documentation because that may create some
4	ambiguity on our part and we have to make sure
5	that in reviewing the record in the past or in
6	the future that all the documentation show who
7	the current owner is.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Very well.
9	Thank you both, Ms. Monroe and Board Member
10	Moldenhauer.
11	It's your testimony under sworn
12	oath that your husband is the current owner of
13	the property?
14	MS. KIMMELL: I bring some
15	comments for all of you. I would like to read
16	if you permit.
17	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Sure.
18	MS. KIMMELL: Okay. Good
19	afternoon everybody and thanks for the
20	opportunity to express my position. Because
21	of the recession of our country the economic
22	situation is getting harder and harder for

everybody and especially for parents that are looking for somebody with a license to take care of their children.

Actually, our center for daily care is full and with a waiting list. After finding a safe and secure place for their children, the parents can look for a job.

That is happening with our community. Actually, I have a long waiting list for the future. Parents call me every single day for an open space. Right now I am counting on your help and support so together we can help our community to fight against our economic crisis.

And to clarify, I am not doing this just for the income because working with parents' voucher. My income is very, very low and if you want to verify this information, you can. When I see the issue of the parking space I feel that I can help the community. Even worse our country because building a parking place in my property is a step for me.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	Right now I'm not getting a high
2	income to afford an investment of that money
3	and we were looking for a way to fill up the
4	request which wasn't easy. I asked my
5	neighbors for help and they offered me their
6	own parking garage. In this case I need it so
7	children and parents depend on your support
8	and help because without your support we can't
9	do anything.
10	I am trying to help the children
11	on the waiting list. Right now all teachers
12	live with me in the home and we have no need
13	for additional parking. If we do ever have to
14	hire someone from outside of the home, I can
15	require that they take public transportation.
16	Thank you.
17	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you. We
18	appreciate that. Now I guess we'll turn to
19	your counsel.
20	Is there any additional closing?
21	MS. ZEGEYE: Well, we just
22	basically want to reiterate the fact that Ms.

Kimmell has gone beyond, I think, what usually people do in terms of trying to get the support of her neighbors, get the support of the ANC for this expansion and special exception and variance request.

We feel as though she has met the burden for both. We won't get into the special exception but for the variance we feel as though her property is unique both in terms of the age of the house, the way it's formed, the trees, and the fact that it's a corner house.

We also believe that requiring her to construct a parking space is going to be extremely burdensome economically for her. We would like to point to the uniqueness of her case where the teachers live there so they don't require a parking space. As long as this is a home day care that she's operating, that is going to be a reality that will continue with the business.

She has a lot of support. She

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

looked for mitigating circumstances and she found a couple and I think she ought to be applauded for it. We really hope that you take all this into consideration when making your decision. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you very much. We appreciate your presentation and your organization of the information in both of the hearings that we've had as well as your witnesses.

I think we have a couple of different options here. We can deliberate today if we feel like both the record is full enough and that we have managed to make our way through all of the record and are prepared to analyze it and walk through it.

Second option is we can put it for decision at a later date. I think we have some room on our calendar next Tuesday. Then a third option, and the applicants have kind of alluded to this throughout the proceeding but haven't really addressed it head on, is

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

that you can consider amending your request for relief to include relief under Section 2116 which is a special exception.

It's a lesser standard than a variance and you've submitted into the record some options, off-site parking options, that arguably might satisfy the parking requirement in this case. I'm not saying that they definitely would but that's an option that you have.

It's not something the Board can force you to do. You would have to do that if you decide you want to do that. If you want to do that, you can do that today. You could amend just by verbally saying that you amend on the record.

My thought is I want a little more time to review everything including some of the sort of late submissions and maybe set it for decision next Tuesday and then to hear from the applicant one way or the other if we are looking at a straight variance issue.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	I'm also not really prepared to go
2	through all the 205 stuff and I think we would
3	probably have to do that for the decision
4	today as well as the variance stuff. That
5	would be my thinking.
6	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I definitely
7	think that this case should not be decided
8	today. There are some additional
9	documentation that I think may help us. I
10	think right now it's either not meeting the
11	standard in my view, or it's just barely
12	squeaking by.
13	In order to try to assist the
14	process and make sure maybe we have more
15	documentation that could help, I would want to
16	maybe see an actually to-scale layout with
17	more dimensions of the space. I would want to
18	see a topographic picture of the area and that
19	is something that the applicant wouldn't have
20	to pay for.
21	There are online services and a

NEAL R. GROSS

lot of different types of maps that you can

1	get of the area that would show the topography
2	for us so that we can understand or, at least,
3	have certain things in the record that would
4	potentially show that there is a grade change
5	in the rear that would make it more
6	practically difficult.
7	One, it would make the property
8	more unique and then, two, would create a
9	practical difficulty in regards to the cost to
10	level out the property or to provide parking.
11	I think those two things would definitely
12	assist me in making the case.
13	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you,
14	Board Member.
15	Are there other Board Members with
16	thoughts on this?
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm sorry. Go
18	ahead? Okay. I guess I would say that there
19	isn't enough information, I think, to decide,
20	frankly, in favor of the variance on parking
21	at this point. If there were additional

information that were presented that proved

that it really was truly difficult to build the parking space in the backyard, then I might be persuaded on that.

Frankly, I think it doesn't look
that difficult. It looks like the dimensions
are there. It looks like you don't need to
excavate the entire yard and dig out a big
flat space there. You probably can ramp it up
gently so you are only excavating three or
four feet in and then ramping up and laying in
some pavers on gravel.

It's not a hugely costly venture to build a parking space in a circumstance like that. I've seen it done dozens of times. I think they still have to prove that somehow that is truly difficult.

Now, when it comes to the standard under 2116.6 or whatever it is, the special exception to locate the parking space off site, if there is an arrangement or they can have an arrangement where another parking space is available nearby and that could be

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1 recorded in some way appropriately in this 2 decision. 3 I think they can meet that test 4 very easily. The standard that I will look at 5 is that it's the forth test when you were reading through them before, Mr. Chairman, the 6 7 fourth test in that the landscaping would be 8 far better not to be touched. 9 It could be located elsewhere and 10 you have an improved landscape on the grounds whether it's for use of the grandchildren or 11 12 the use of the children in the child care 13 center. Either way I think it's easy to meet 14 that test. In fact, if they wanted to go 15 ahead and amend the application right now, I 16 would be ready to go ahead and decide now. 17 CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, 18 Commissioner May. Any additional thoughts? 19 MEMBER SORG: Actually, that's 20 exactly what I was going to suggest. I agree 2.1 with Mr. May. Also it looks like most of the

NEAL R. GROSS

work has been done to meet the requirements,

as far as I understand them, for the off-site parking.

But I think that if the applicant were to go forward and come back with this, they would be well advised to take a couple of comments from Ms. Moldenhauer and Mr. May into account that I think there are some possibly compelling arguments that have to do with the future use perhaps of the recreation space and the cost here, but I don't think they have been made in a way that we can really rest that much on them.

I also do agree from what we have seen here, which I think has been said, is not exactly enough to tell one way or the other but my gut feeling is that the practical difficulty based on the topography of the property is not necessarily an easy thing to show.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you. So we now are at the same kind of crossroads I think we were a little bit earlier. There is

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

a variance test and it's a pretty high standard for the variance test. We kind of got an inkling of where different Board Members are on that.

On the other hand, what we are trying to get at here is a requirement for one off-street parking street. There's more than one way to skin a cat. There is, as Mr. May indicated, this special exception that would allow satisfaction of that required parking space but that would take an amendment from the applicant that authorizes this Board to review this as a special exception.

Mr. May indicated further he would be willing to support that today. I'm not quite there. I think it's a very strong case. I just need a little more time to pull all my information together in terms of walking through the whole 205 piece and then the 2116 piece. I think as early as next Tuesday I would be ready to walk through it like that.

MS. NAGELHOUT: Can I just

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

1	interject for a second?
2	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Yes.
3	MS. NAGELHOUT: If the young
4	ladies would like to amend, I think they
5	should be given a few minutes to look at the
6	language of the special exception so they know
7	what they're amending and what they're saying.
8	What I'm thinking is maybe if you want to
9	break I can give them the regs.
10	They can sit down for 10 minutes,
11	look at them, see if it would be a reasonable
12	approach they would like to take and confer
13	with the professor. If you are going to
14	decide next week, we need to know now what
15	we're deciding. Otherwise, you can put it off
16	a week and then put the decision off. It's up
17	to you but I think they need to look at the
18	language of the special exception.
19	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: I think that is
20	a reasonable request. Would you like an
21	opportunity to review this a little?

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Before they

1	take a look at it I want to make sure they are
2	aware that if the application was amended a
3	special exception for off-street parking is a
4	lesser relief request so there would not be a
5	requirement for additional notice.
6	Your parking variance notice would
7	be sufficient for any amendment so there would
8	be no concern about needed to renotice the
9	community for that change. If you did decide
10	to amend the application, we could then go
11	forward even as early as next week and make a
12	decision on the case.
13	MS. ZEGEYE: Let's look at the
14	regs.
15	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All right. Why
16	don't we break for maybe five minutes. Ten
17	minutes? Five? Ten? You guys are quick
18	studies but if you want to, we'll do 10.
19	Let's break for 10 minutes.
20	(Whereupon, at 3:35 p.m. off the
21	record until 4:00 p.m.)
22	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Good afternoon.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	We are back in session on the final case of
2	the afternoon, Case No. 17975. I think we
3	wanted to turn back to the counsel for
4	applicants regarding proceeding forward.
5	MS. SALA: We wish to request
6	amend to request a special exception under
7	2116.6.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay.
9	MS. SALA: And we also wish to ask
10	if there is any other questions specifically
11	you have that we should be prepared for.
12	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: All right. I
13	think that's a great way to sort of end where
14	we are now because once we decide that we're
15	going to go into the deliberation, you
16	wouldn't have a chance to ask any questions.
17	Let's see if there are any questions that
18	Board Members have before we decide to do what
19	we're going to do.
20	I don't think so. I don't believe
21	there are any questions. With the request for
22	an amendment we will now formally put that

into our record and the application is
formally amended to seek relief in addition to
205 under 2116 for the location of required
spaces off site.
I think we probably can deliberate

I think we probably can deliberate this case today. I'll start us off and officially close the record. I don't think that we need any additional information since we are going to take a look at this as a Section 2116 case.

Section 205 for a child development center in the R-1-B District. With respect to the 205 criteria the record before us indicates that the applicant has put together a strong case for Section 205 relief. I'm not going to go through each element of 205 but I'll touch upon the ones that I think help the applicant meet its burden.

Under 205.3 the facility needs to be located and designed to create no objectional traffic conditions nor unsafe

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

conditions for pickup and drop off. As
indicated in the OP report the center is
located such that there is no violation of
Section 205.3.
In fact, the DDOT submitted a

2.1

report indicating that there would not be any unsafe conditions for pickup and drop off, nor objectional traffic conditions. It is pretty significant that the DDOT report so stated.

In addition to which on-street parking is available for parents to pickup and drop off children and that would be on either 8th Street or Van Buren Street, very close to the subject property. The center will provide sufficient off-street parking spaces to meet the reasonable needs of teachers, other employees, and visitors.

In this case there is a requirement for one parking space since there is a staff of four. We'll come back to that when we talk about Section 2116 relief.

Section 205.5, the center facility including

NEAL R. GROSS

any outdoor play area shall be located and designed so that there is no objectional impacts on adjacent or nearby property owners due to noise, activity, visual or other objectionable conditions.

In this case the evidence is that none of the adjacent neighbors have objected to the location of the facility. In fact, one of the adjacent neighbors is offering her rear parking pad for the project and that indicates that there is no objection there.

In addition to that, the ANC has indicated that they support the project, although for technical reasons it may not receive great weight but that is further indication of meeting 205.5.

Under 205.6 the Board can require special treatment in the way of design, screening of buildings, planting and so on and so forth. In this case the Office of Planning doesn't recommend and I don't believe any Board Members have any recommendations in that

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

regard.

2.1

205.7, an off-site play area has to be located so as not to result in endangerment to individuals in attendance at the center or facility, particularly in traveling between the facility and the play area.

In this case the applicant will use Takoma Rec Center at 300 Van Buren Street. It's going to be an off-site play area, testimony being that the rear yard is not sufficient for that at present. The students will be brought there under the supervision of facility staff. The playground at the rec center is fenced in and there is a gate to control access and further protect the children.

As indicated the staff members will walk the children there and there is notably a public sidewalk available for the whole walk. Sometimes in these cases young people have to walk on dirt roads or there are

NEAL R. GROSS

1 unpaved sidewalk but that's not the case here. 2 There is a requirement that the 3 Board can approve more than one child/elderly 4 development center within 1,000 feet of another if there are no adverse traffic 5 6 impacts. It doesn't apply here because 7 according to the evidence in the record, notably the OP report, there isn't any other 8 9 child development center within 1,000 square 10 feet. 205.9, the Board needs to refer --11 12 the Board is the BZA -- refer the application 13 to the Departments of Transportation, Human 14 Services, Aging and Planning for review and 15 written reports. In this case it happened 16 with respect to the Department of 17 Transportation and Human Services. I think we 18 typically send it out to OSSE for that 19 response. 20 Office of Aging that only applies 2.1 if we are talking about elderly care. We're

NEAL R. GROSS

not talking about that here. In this case

OSSE did submit a report recommending approval of the application. That was dated July 24, 2009 and it was signed by Valerie Ware who runs that office is very familiar to those of us here at BZA so it meets that criteria.

As I indicated, DDOT submitted a report that has not found any adverse traffic impacts or potential for adverse traffic impacts. Then 205.10, the referral to the DHS shall request advice as to whether the center can meet all licensing requirements and, again, it's indicated in the OSSE report there is a full recommendation for the project to be approved by the BZA.

With respect to the park relief as indicated, there is a required parking requirement for one space on site, a couple of different ways to get at providing that one space. One of the ways we talked about earlier, and I think the applicant came prepared with a briefing on that, and that was a variance from the requirement.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

An alternative way is under

Section 2116 which is a mechanism that allows through special exception the location of a required parking space off site. Because it's a special exception it's a lesser burden than the variance. A number of Board Members thought that the evidence was really, really going to be difficult for the variance.

However, some of the requirements that would

However, some of the requirements that would be really germane to a variance are not needed for the special exception.

Under the special exception that
we are taking a look at, one of the ways that
the Board can find an off-site parking
requirement satisfies the overall requirement
is to make a determination that it's not
practical to locate the spaces in accordance
with the on-site requirements for the
following reasons. Four reasons are listed
and they are listed in the alternative so that
you don't have to have all of these. It's not
in the conjunctive but just one of the four

will do.

2.1

Which the requirement can be met under the special exception is that the Board makes a determination that the location of required parking spaces elsewhere on the same lot or, in this case, on another lot would result in more efficient use of land, better design or landscaping, safer ingress or egress, and less adverse impact on neighboring properties.

I think the testimony in response to some questions that I asked Mr. Mordfin this afternoon was that it would probably be a more efficient use of land to locate the parking space off site and would certainly result in better design and/or landscaping to not have to butcher those three trees that are currently in the rear of the property. I think the Board can safely make a determination that 2116.6(d) is met.

Then the other requirements of 2116. I'm not going to go over each of them

NEAL R. GROSS

in great detail but 2116.7 says there is a preference when you are going to locate a parking space off site. To meet a required parking space that it be separated only by an alley from the lot upon which the building or structure is located or on an adjacent lot.

I think in this case 6620 8th

Street is directly next door to 6524 8th

Street so it's adjacent to the property. Mr.

Mordfin wanted to make sure that we were

mindful that there has to be sufficient

parking for the required parking for that off
site location; that is, one space for the

residential as well as space that the

applicant would use.

We saw through the exhibits that had been submitted that both with respect to the property that belongs to Francis R. Yates, 6520 8th Street, that there was sufficient parking for two parking spaces and especially with respect to the property that belongs to Mr. Velasquez -- I believe that's the

NEAL R. GROSS

2.1

pronunciation -- at 6512 8th Street, that there were spaces for two vehicles.

2.1

Both of these neighbors indicated in written and signed statements that they are willing to offer the applicant the access to and use of their off-street parking spot. I believe that satisfies the requirements under 2116. With that let me open it up to other Board members for any thoughts.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I would say that you summarized things very well and I think addressed the thorniest issue which was the parking. I think the circumstances of the parking space was a real struggle to consider that as a variance but under the special exception test to assign the parking to an off-site location nearby I think is certainly better designed and more efficient use of land and will look better and meets the requirements that we have so I think it's the right way to go.

CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Mr.

NEAL R. GROSS

1 | May.

2.1

Are there others?

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I would just make a general comment that I think that the two young attorneys did a great job. I think that they presented a very solid case and it sounds like from the deliberation, which I concur with the Chairman, that there will be a positive result for their client.

I think that it was a great

learning experience for you. I think as

another attorney some recommendations would be

always have copies for all of the Board

Members or, if you're in a court of law, for

opposing counsel and for the judge and

everything to that effect whenever you come

prepared with something.

Always go through and try to present -- here exactly I know that Chairman Loud provided some procedural aspects. I think it's good to go and sit in and watch a procedure at one point in time. That way you

NEAL R. GROSS

1 know kind of what process is going next. 2 We follow a very stringent process 3 where we go from one person and then to OP and 4 then questions and things to that effect and 5 you ended up asking some good questions to OP. 6 That was just something that maybe if you had 7 kind of taken a look at something at another 8 hearing would have been a great opportunity. 9 Again, I think it was a great job and I think 10 it will be a very positive result for your 11 client. 12 CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Board Member Moldenhauer. 13 One final note of business is that 14 15 the Office of Planning recommends a five-year term for the Section 205 relief. I'm inclined 16 17 to think that is a good condition to impose. 18 So, with that being said, I would 19 like to move approval of Application No. 17975 20 as amended for Section 205 relief to permit a 2.1 child development center in the R-1-B District

subject to the following condition; that

1	approval shall be for a period of five years
2	and for approval of parking relief under
3	Section 2116 to locate a required parking
4	space off site at the 6520 8th Street, N.W.
5	and alternatively if for some reason that is
6	not available in the future at 6512 8th
7	Street, N.W.
8	Is there further discussion? I'm
9	sorry. Is there a second?
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
11	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: The motion has
12	been made and seconded.
13	MS. NAGELHOUT: Mr. Chair.
14	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Yes.
15	MS. NAGELHOUT: Is the parking
16	special exception also termed? I just want to
17	make sure because they are two separate
18	special exceptions.
19	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you.
20	Yes, it is. Yes, same five-year term.
21	So, again, to clarify, the motion
22	has been made for approval of the application

1	for five years for the 205 for approval of the
2	parking relief for five years of 2116. I
3	believe it's been seconded. The motion has
4	been made and seconded. Is there further
5	discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor
6	say aye.
7	ALL: Aye.
8	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: There is no
9	opposition but are there any abstentions?
10	Ms. Bailey, can you read back the
11	vote?
12	MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, the
13	vote is recorded as four zero one to grant the
14	application as amended and to include two
15	conditions. The motion was made by Chairman
16	Loud, seconded by Mr. May. Mrs. Moldenhauer
17	and Ms. Sorg support the motion. Mr. Dettman
18	is not present.
19	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Thank you, Ms.
20	Bailey. Is there anything further in this
21	case?
22	MS. BAILEY: Not for this case,

1	Mr. Chairman.
2	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Can we do this
3	as a summary?
4	MS. BAILEY: Summary.
5	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: Okay. Let's do
6	it as a summary order. Again, to echo Board
7	Member Moldenhauer's remarks, very good job.
8	Congratulations.
9	MS. SALA: Thank you.
10	MS. ZEGEYE: Thank you.
11	CHAIRPERSON LOUD: We are
12	adjourned if we have no further business for
13	the day. BZA is adjourned.
14	(Whereupon, at 4:15 p.m. the
15	hearing was adjourned.)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

1

NEAL R. GROSS